

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. DENT, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13548) to authorize the resumption of voluntary enlistments in the Regular Army, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 891), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 13669) to prohibit immigration for a period of four years, and to restrict immigration thereafter; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13670) to amend the war-risk insurance act by providing for the transfer of jurisdiction of, and all claims for, compensation for death or disability from the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance to the Bureau of Pensions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a resolution (H. Res. 493) amending paragraphs 25 and 26 of Rule XI; to the Committee on Rules.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. PARKER of New York laid on the Speaker's desk a petition of electors of district and State of New York relating to Senate bill 5306 and House bill 13159, which was referred to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, January 7, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we worship Thee. Thou hast sent forth the spirit of Thy Son to the hearts of men crying "Abba Father." We are Thy children, and we are heirs of God. We would feel not only the sacred obligation but the high inspiration of the call of God to places of leadership and power. We pray that we may discharge our duties as the sons of God to extend Thy kingdom and the spirit of Thy peace among men. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FUNERAL OF THE LATE EX-PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has not been informed officially with reference to the funeral services over the body of the late President of the United States in any other way than by the newspapers. The newspaper announcement is that it is to be a private funeral. The Senate, however, having taken steps to send a committee, the Chair wishes to announce that if any Senators desirous of going will communicate with the Sergeant at Arms, arrangements will be made for their transportation and comfort.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, it has been ascertained that some of the Senators appointed yesterday as members of the committee to attend the funeral of the late ex-President Theodore Roosevelt are either out of town or are unable to accompany the congressional committees to-day. I ask, therefore, that five additional names be added to the Senate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] as additional members of the committee.

SENATOR FROM NEVADA.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read the certificate of election of Hon. CHARLES B. HENDERSON, Senator elect from the State of Nevada to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Francis G. Newlands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

STATE OF NEVADA,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, CHARLES B. HENDERSON was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Nevada a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States and to fill the vacancy therein caused by the death of Francis G. Newlands, and that said vacancy was filled by the election of CHARLES B. HENDERSON as aforesaid, according to law.

Witness, his excellency our governor, Emmet D. Boyle, and our seal hereto affixed at Carson City, this 30th day of December, in the year of our Lord 1918.

EMMET D. BOYLE, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

GEORGE BRODIGAN, Secretary of State.

Mr. KING. Senator HENDERSON is in the Chamber, and I ask that the oath may be administered to him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the credentials? If not, the Senator elect will present himself at the desk for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

Mr. HENDERSON was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. KING, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him, he took his seat in the Senate.

SENATOR FROM KANSAS.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I present the certificate of election of ARTHUR CAPPER, Senator elect from the State of Kansas. I ask that the credentials may be read and filed. They are in the regular form.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on file, as follows:

State of Kansas, certificate of election—United States Senator from Kansas.

To the PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, ARTHUR CAPPER was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Kansas a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years, beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness, his excellency our governor, ARTHUR CAPPER, and our seal hereto affixed at the State capitol in the city of Topeka, this 2d day of December, in the year of our Lord 1918.

ARTHUR CAPPER, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

J. T. BOTKIN, Secretary of State.

CAPITAL ISSUES COMMITTEE (S. DOC. NO. 328).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Capital Issues Committee, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 15, 1918, a statement showing the total expenses of the Capital Issues Committee to December 31, 1918, which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES (S. DOC. NO. 327).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in the department January 1, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, transmitted to the Senate resolutions on the death of Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented resolutions adopted by the National Association of Woolen and Worsted Overseers in convention assembled at Worcester, Mass., favoring a protective tariff, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Worcester, Mass., favoring the freedom of Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NELSON presented a resolution adopted by the Western Fruit Jobbers' Association, submitted by E. P. Stacy & Sons, of Minneapolis, Minn., relative to the disposition of Federal controlled utilities, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CALDER. I present resolutions unanimously adopted at a meeting of the members of the parish of the Blessed Sacrament Church, in Brooklyn, N. Y., held under the auspices of the Parish Forum on Thursday, December 19, 1918, favoring self-determination for Ireland. I ask that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Resolutions adopted unanimously at a meeting of the members of the parish of the Blessed Sacrament, held under the auspices of the Parish Forum on Thursday evening, Dec. 19, 1918, favoring self-determination for Ireland.]

Whereas recent articles in the metropolitan press, including some well-displayed utterances of certain of our public men, seem to be inspired by forces who desire to discredit the efforts of our great President toward the establishment of a just basis for a permanent peace; and

Whereas in such an emergency it is incumbent upon all loyal citizens who believe in the justice of the principles enunciated by our President to make their voices heard in opposition to the efforts of those evil or misguided men;

Therefore the members of the Parish of the Blessed Sacrament and their friends, in public meeting assembled on this 19th day of December, 1918, declare:

That we rejoice with our fellow citizens at the victorious conclusion of the war and the triumph of the ideals for which America entered the war.

That we take justifiable pride in the record for bravery and patriotic fervor made by the men of the Irish race in the Army and Navy and the important part they played in the decisive battles for the democratic freedom of the world.

That we applaud the determination of our President to be present at and participate in the proceedings of the peace congress, to the end that full effect be given to the principles enunciated by him in his addresses to Congress, his state papers, and his speeches, which have been accepted by the American people as the true reason and purpose of America's participation in the war.

That the most important of those principles—that of self-determination as to the form of government by the consent of the people who are to be governed—should be applied to the people of Ireland in conformity with America's declaration.

That the Irish people are by race, language, and tradition a distinct and separate people; that their country is a nation with well-defined geographical boundaries; that they have exercised sovereign rights for a thousand years and have been deprived of them by force; that they have never surrendered or compromised those rights; that they have not ceased to struggle, morally and physically, to recover those rights; that they are withheld from them by force; and that the only rule which prevails in their country to-day is the rule of force against the will of the people.

That on every battle field, from the earliest in the Revolution to the latest in France, where American ideals were fought for and American institutions and interests defended, the Irish race in America have freely given their blood and lives and linked themselves with everything so essentially American that with truth and confidence they may now say to their country in this supreme hour, "Stand for the people whose sons have stood for you and show grateful recognition as well as vindicate right and justice."

Therefore we respectfully but earnestly urge that our President declare at the peace congress that the people of Ireland should, as matter of right and justice, be governed only in accordance with their consent, and that the will of the majority—ascertained by a plebiscite of the adult population—be accepted as the sovereign will of the people instead of the present foreign rule by force.

JOHN J. FOOTE, Chairman.

Mr. CALDER. I present also a petition of citizens of the Borough of Richmond, city of New York, favoring self-determination for Ireland, which I ask be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas President Wilson has repeatedly declared that one of America's objects in entering the war was to secure for all small nations the right to determine for themselves the form of government under which they desired to live; and

Whereas on the strength of the President's declarations the American people sent their sons into the Army and Navy, poured out their blood and treasure lavishly, and Irish citizens performed their full share in the fighting and other sacrifices; and

Whereas Ireland is one of the small nations and has the same right to freedom as the others and, in addition, has struggled for freedom for centuries and her people are now more united in the determination to secure it than at any time in the last 700 years; and

Whereas it would be a travesty of justice to hold that men of Irish blood sacrificed themselves in this war to bring freedom to the Czechs, Serbs, Poles, Jugo-Slavs, and others, but not to the people of Ireland: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, citizens of the Borough of Richmond, city of New York, in mass meeting assembled at St. Peter's Hall, New Brighton, this 15th day of December, declare:

1. Our unqualified approval of the 14 terms of peace laid down by our President.

2. We heartily indorse his decision to participate in the peace conference in person.

3. We respectfully submit as our firm conviction that Ireland should be included among the small nations entitled to the right of self-determination by a vote of her adult population. Be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to our Representatives in Congress, with the request that they expedite, as far as in their power, the speedy adoption by Congress of one of the many resolutions now before that body relating to self-determination for Ireland.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram from the Deadwood Business Club, of South Dakota, relative to the disposition of railroads, telegraph, telephone, and cable lines, and express companies.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEADWOOD, S. DAK., December 10.

HON. THOMAS STERLING,
Washington, D. C.:

Resolved, That it is the sentiment of the Deadwood Business Club that railroads, express companies, telegraph, telephone, and cable lines, which were taken over for operation by the Government as a war measure, should be returned to their respective owners for operation with least possible delay, that the country be restored to an industrial-peace basis as soon as possible.

DEADWOOD BUSINESS CLUB.

Mr. STERLING. I also send to the desk a letter and a resolution from the Farmers' Grain Dealers Association of South Dakota, relating to the disposition of railroads, which I ask may be read by the Secretary.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

SIOUX FALLS, S. DAK., December 28, 1918.

HON. THOMAS STERLING,
Senator, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We realize that it will be some time before Congress will come to any conclusion as to the final disposition of the railroad question. Sentiment in South Dakota is very strong to have all public utilities turned back to private ownership in the shortest possible time, as all are convinced that Government control or ownership, with the menace of politics and inefficiency attached, are not the things that they want after a year of experience. In the meantime, and until this question is finally disposed of, our association, which is so vitally interested in all freight rates and all matters concerning transportation, requests that all rate making, investigating, and suspension powers be restored, absolutely as existing before the war, to the Interstate Commerce Commission, State railway commissions, and the courts, restoring to us our constitutional right of appeal. The Farmers' Grain Dealers Association of South Dakota, in convention assembled, therefore has adopted the following resolution by unanimous vote:

"In order to give fair and just representation to all shippers in all States and to guarantee against sudden unnecessary or unreasonable advances in freight rates, we demand that the rights be restored immediately to the State railway commission and to the Interstate Commission to suspend and initiate rates and to adjudicate all rates before same shall become effective, as authorized in the Cummins amendment or some similar act. Our secretary is hereby instructed to communicate these resolutions to our national Congressmen and Senators and to the South Dakota Railway Commission and the department of history of South Dakota.

"We ask you as our Representatives in Congress to support legislation to bring this about."

Very truly, yours,

FARMERS' GRAIN DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH DAKOTA.
CHAS. H. EYLER, Secretary.

THE RAILROAD PROBLEM.

Mr. STERLING. I send to the desk an editorial taken from the New York Times of Sunday last relating to the same subject. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RAILROAD PROBLEM.

Private ownership and operation of the railroads, with Federal regulation, competition in service and facilities, but not in rates, and the delivery of the roads from the endless confusion of conflicting State regulations—that is the solution of the railroad problem favored by Judge Robert S. Lovett, one of the ablest and most experienced railroad executives of the country. Competition in rates, in his opinion, inevitably leads to rebates, secret rates, and other kindred evils; competition in facilities and in service produces better accommodation for the public and encourages initiative, enterprise, and the employment in railroad service of the best brains. It is notorious that public ownership everywhere exerts a deadening influence upon the development of the art and industry involved.

Under Federal ownership of the railroad systems of the country the public-buildings scandal would become vastly more flagrant. Just as Congressmen purchase the favor of their constituents at public cost by securing extravagant appropriations for post offices and customhouses, so wide-awake communities with an eye to their own interest would demand, and secure, fine new railroad stations and increased facilities which would not pay their costs. These are matters to be considered when Mr. McAdoo holds up to our view his picture of the benefits of Federal control. For one thing, first-class ability would disappear from railroad management; the compensation offered by the Government would not attract the kind of men that have built up and operated our great railroad systems; there would be no Vanderbilts, no James J. Hilla, no Scotts, no Harrimans, no Lovetts, no Lorees, or Ripleys engaged in railroading.

The outstanding capitalization of all the railroads in the country amounted two years ago to \$20,679,350,501—in stock, \$8,958,815,811; in bonds, \$11,720,534,690. The standard return upon the lines which Judge Lovett describes as class 1 roads, now under Federal control, amounts to upward of \$900,000,000. Capitalized at 5 per cent, this would represent a little more than \$18,000,000,000 of value. If the Government should acquire the roads, it would become obligated for this gigantic sum. The Treasury has sold \$17,000,000,000 of liberty bonds; it must sell billions more. If we should add to the war debt thus created a railroad debt approaching \$20,000,000,000, the Government would be loaded down with a burden of obligation never dreamed of before we entered upon this era of big figures.

It is all very well for Mr. McAdoo to argue, as he is doing before the Interstate Commerce Committee of the Senate, that an extension to five years of the period of Federal control is necessary to carry out improvements he has in mind. Although he disclaims any such purpose, the public is unable to see any difference between his argument for a five-year period and an argument for permanent Federal control, which would mean, of course, Federal ownership. That brings into

view at once not only the very grave objections immediately related to railroad operation, objections which are lucidly presented by Judge Lovett, but it compels consideration of the fathomless sea of political evils into which we should be plunged by the enormous increase in the number of Government employees. Already organizations of railroad employees are petitioning for Government ownership. That was inevitable. It was foreseen, for Mr. McAdoo tells us that under his directorship wages have been advanced during the last year to an amount exceeding \$600,000,000. An autocracy is the only form of government which would be proof against the tremendous political pressure arising out of Government ownership and operation of \$20,000,000,000 worth of railroads. In a democracy no party, though it boasted of adamant virtue, could resist it.

THE MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I have a short memorandum prepared by Hon. A. R. Smith, editor of the Marine News and former commissioner of navigation, in reference to the policy of discriminating import duties and tonnage dues for building up the merchant marine. It is a very clear and concise statement, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Memorandum regarding the policy of discriminating import duties and tonnage dues for building up and maintaining American shipping in foreign carrying.]

1. This policy was a part of the first tariff act, signed by President Washington on July 4, 1789.
2. At first it provided a 10 per cent discount of the duty on imports in American vessels; but this was too severe a drain on the National Treasury, so it was changed to an extra, higher duty on imports in foreign vessels, which added money to the National Treasury if it failed to help our ships. Tonnage dues were 50 cents a ton on foreign vessels each time they entered American ports, and only 6 cents a ton on American ships.
3. This policy was in full force from 1789 until 1815; thereafter it was in partial force until 1846, its provisions between times having been gradually suspended; but the original act has been upon our statutes since 1789, its operation merely suspended by other acts of Congress, as well as trade treaties, conventions, and agreements.
4. During the period the policy was in full force American ships averaged nearly 90 per cent of our entire foreign carrying.
5. As a result of over 60 consecutive years of full or partial operation its effects carried our shipping along fairly well until 1861, for 11 years after the suspension of the discriminatory laws became general.
6. During the first 72 years of our national existence under the present Constitution—1789 until 1861—an average of 80 per cent of our imports and exports were carried in American ships.
7. When this policy was in force the denial of American registry to foreign-built vessels gave protection to American-built vessels; but when the policy was suspended the denial of our registry to foreign-built ships ceased to constitute a protection. Foreign ships then enjoyed every right in our ports in foreign carrying that American ships enjoyed.
8. Retaliatory measures were resorted to by other nations, chiefly England, to offset the preference for American ships in American carrying established by this policy, but they failed; always they failed, the best proof of which is the proportion of our own carrying our own ships did while it was in force.
9. It was said that we could not abrogate in a wholesale way some 22 trade treaties in force between this country and other countries, by which we pledged ourselves not to resort to that policy; but other nations at different times have abrogated at least 15 such treaties, and everyone of them was affected and had to be altered when the seamen's act went into full effect.
10. Twice of recent years efforts have been made to revive this policy—in the Dingley tariff of 1897 and in the Underwood tariff of 1913—and the details of how the purposes of Congress were thwarted are most interesting.
11. It is the only specific affirmative policy for building up our shipping in foreign trade that the Republican Party ever declared for (in 1896 national platform), at which time the presidential candidate (Maj. McKinley) warmly indorsed it in his letter of acceptance of the presidential nomination.
12. This policy takes nothing out of the National Treasury, but rather adds money to it, and it protects our ships by the same instrument (the tariff) that every other American product subject to foreign competition is protected.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I present resolutions adopted by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association in reference to a bill to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission the powers it exercised before the war. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

THE AMERICAN SHIRE HORSE ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present a communication from J. G. Truman, president of the American Shire Horse Association. It is one of probably a hundred letters, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD. I do not ask that it be read. I selected it from the number. It is an objection to the return of the horses that are in the American Expeditionary Forces. It sets forth the dangers of communicating various diseases that are prevalent in horses abroad. The danger of communicating them here is very great.

There being no objection, the communication was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMERICAN SHIRE HORSE ASSOCIATION, BUSHNELL, ILL., December 13, 1918.

Senator L. Y. SHERMAN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been advised and it seemed to be common talk among horsemen at the International Live Stock Exposition last week that the Quartermaster General of the United States Army has decided to return to this country some of the horses and mules which have been shipped to Europe for military purposes.

Now, Senator, this will certainly be a very serious mistake if they bring even one of the horses that have been exposed to the diseases that exist especially among the Army horses on the other side. I would not for a moment, if I were you, allow the return of one Army horse. There really is no reason why they should be returned to this country on account of the fact that commercial horses in Europe are very scarce and high. The same horses that the Government has over there would bring practically twice the money that they would bring if brought back here, and in addition there would be the high cost of transportation.

In other words, if those horses were shipped back here they would not bring any more than enough to pay their transportation charges. It would certainly be a terrible disaster to have an epidemic imported to this country by European army horses along the same line that we are having with the Spanish influenza.

I trust that you will use your best efforts with the Quartermaster General of the Army and also Dr. J. R. Mohler, Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, Washington, D. C., both of whom we are writing.

I may say that in writing you I am representing no less than 1,073 of the leading draft-horse breeders of the United States.

Yours, very truly,

J. G. TRUMAN, President.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I also present from a number of communications of a like kind on universal suffrage a resolution of the Illinois Woman's Legislative Congress, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Illinois Woman's Legislative Congress, a delegate body representing the following organizations from all parts of the State, in convention assembled, December 27 and 28, 1918, at the Congress Hotel, Chicago, Ill., does hereby urge the United States Senate to take speedy and favorable action on the Federal suffrage amendment.

Auburn Park Woman's Club; Austin North End Woman's Club; Altrui Club; Aurora Woman's Club; Arion Aid and Benevolent Society; Cynthia Westover Alden Sunshine Society; Chicago Woman's Club; Chrysolite Club; Chicago Literary Score; Community Club of Englewood; Chicago Heights Woman's Club; Chicago Woman's Patriotic Association; Catholic Woman's League; Chicago South Side Club; Champaign Social Science Club; Current Topic Club of Blue Island; Chicago Federation Colored Women's Clubs; Council of Jewish Women; Chicago Political Equality League; Catholic Woman's League of Rogers Park; Chicago Association of Collegiate Alumnae; Committee on Public Affairs; Civic Federation, Peoria; Child Welfare League, Peoria; Carbondale Civic and Suffrage League; Chicago Lawn Club; Church Federation; Chicago Equality League of Rogers Park; City Club State Council; Downers Grove Woman's Club; De Kalb Woman's Club; Des Plaines Woman's Club; Daughters of the American Revolution, Peoria; Englewood Woman's Club; Every Wednesday Club; Englewood Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Every Wednesday Literary Score; Eighteenth District Federation of Women's Clubs; Eugenic Educational Society; First District Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs; Friends in Council; Fifth Ward Civic League; Federation of Woman's High School Teachers; Fellowship Club; Glen Ellyn Woman's Club; Galesburg Woman's Club; Grant Park Woman's Club; Good Will Workers; Hollywood Woman's Club; Hadassah, Chicago Chapter; Hyde Park Housewives' Committee; Hull House Woman's Club; Hyde Park Travel Club; Illinois Sunflower Club; Illinois Colony Club; Improvement Association for Blind People; Illinois League for Nursery Education; Independent German-American Woman's Club; Irving Park Woman's Club; Isalah Woman's Club; Illinois Federation of Women's Clubs, Third District; Illinois Congress and Parent Teachers' Association; Illinois Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Illinois Equal Suffrage Association; Kenrose Woman's Club; Kilo Association; Kane County Federation of Women's Clubs; Kankakee Woman's Club; Kenmore Club; Lady Montefiore Lodge No. 12; Lombard Woman's Club; La Grange Woman's Club; Lotus County Woman's Club; Lake View Woman's Club; Lincoln Lodge; Martha Washington Club; Moss Mart Club; Mothers' Aid, Chicago; Lying-In Hospital and Dispensary; Maywood Catholic Woman's Club; Mayfair Woman's Club; Maywood Twentieth Century Club; Mount Carroll Woman's Club; Neighborhood House Woman's Club; Neighborhood Club of Forest Park; National Ship of State; Neighborhood Civic Club of Oak Park; Norwegian Woman's Club; Nineteenth Century Club; Neighborhood House Club; Ottawa Woman's Club; Osteopathic Woman's Club; Outlook Club, Peoria; Parkside Woman's Club; Phyllis Wheatley Woman's Club; Mrs. Ella Park, delegate at large; Portage Park Woman's Club; Peoria Woman's Club; Park Manor Woman's Club; Park Ridge Woman's Club; Ravenswood Woman's Club; Roseland Woman's Club; Rest Haven, Sarah Greenbaum Lodge, No. 10; Rochelle Civic Council; Riverside Woman's Club; River Forest Woman's Club; Rock River Falls Woman's Club; Rodgers Park Woman's Club; Social Service League of Jewish Women; Scanlan School Parent Teachers' Association; Sixth Ward Civic League; Sanitary District, Public Affairs Committee; Social Workers, Women and Children in Industry Club; Seventh Ward Auxiliary, Illinois Equal Suffrage Association; Seventh Ward District, Federation Women's Clubs; Sycamore Woman's Club; Second District Illinois Federation Women's Clubs; the Elgin Woman's Club; the Woman's Club of Austin; Tuscola Woman's Club; Twenty-fourth Ward League; the Arche Club; the Woman's Club of Berwyn; the Mothers' Relief Association of Chicago; Twenty-sixth Ward Civic League; the Tuesday Club; Temple Judea Woman's Club; Teachers' Club, Peoria; Chicago Teachers' Federation; Tenth Congressional District Woman's Trade Union; United Railway Auxiliary Club; University of Chicago Settlement Workers; Universalist Church Woman's Club; Virden Woman's Club; Woman's Association of Commerce; Woman's Club of Harvey; Wicker Park Woman's Club; Windsor Park Woman's Club; Woodlawn Woman's Christian Temperance Union; West Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union; Woman's Club of Libertyville; Woman's Club of the Allied Drug Trade; Woman's Club of Clyde;

Winnetka Woman's Club; Woman's Culture Club; Woman's Protective Association; Woman's Church Federation of Oak Park; Woman's Club of Joliet; Woodstock Woman's Club; Woman's Committee State Council of Defense; Woman's Club of Wilmette; Woman's Club of Rock Island; Mary Gaynor Wilson, delegate at large; Woman's Suburban Church Federation; Woman's Medical Club; Woman's Church Federation; West End Catholic League; Woman's Catholic League; Woman's City Club; Woman's Trade Union League; Woman's College Club; Woodlawn Study Club; Young Woman's Auxiliary of the Jewish Relief Society; Woman's Club of Moline; Woman's Department Club of Wheaton; Woman's Club of Hinsdale; Western Springs Woman's Club; Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cook County; Woodlawn Woman's Club.

Mr. SHERMAN. I also present and do not ask to have printed resolutions adopted by the Chicago Equal Suffrage Association, of the State of Illinois, on the subject of woman suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will lie on the table.

FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. GORE. I present a series of resolutions and letters sent to me by a committee representing various farmers' organizations, desiring to have an investigation of the cost of producing farm products in general and sugar beets in particular. I move that the resolutions and letters be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The motion was agreed to.

COST OF EAGLE BOATS.

Mr. LODGE. I present newspaper articles continuing those printed in the Record in regard to the Eagle boats. I ask that they be printed in the Record and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Daily Iron Trade and Metal Market Report, Cleveland, Ohio, Dec. 30, 1918.]

FORD MAY GET NEW \$3,500,000 RIVER ROUGE EAGLE PLANT FROM NAVY AT BARGAIN PRICE—CONTRACT SHOWS THAT FORD, WHILE DECRYING ALL WAR PROFITS, UNDER CONTRACT GETS HIS EARLY—NAVY IS SADDLING BIG EXPENSE ON COUNTRY—NAVAL OFFICERS CONDEMN STAND.

[This is the third article on Henry Ford's Eagle boats. These are 204-foot, single-screw, steel, 500-ton submarine chasers, costing about \$550,000 each, of which the Navy intends to build 60, at a total cost of \$33,000,000, although all need for them ceased with the signing of the armistice. The first article appeared last Thursday and the second last Friday.]

NAVY'S CREDIT RATING NOT HIGH WITH HENRY FORD.

"The fixed sum for profit shall be payable as follows: Ten thousand dollars shall be payable on each vessel as and when such vessel is half completed as certified by the inspectors; \$9,000 shall be payable when such vessel is preliminarily accepted; and the remaining \$1,000 to complete the \$20,000 fixed profit payable on each vessel shall be held to constitute the special reserve. Such profits for profit shall be payable on the monthly bills of actual costs when and as accrued."—Ford Motor Co. Eagle contract.

"I will not take a cent of profit out of the war work I am doing. * * * It is impossible to determine in advance just what the cost of everything will be."—By Henry Ford.

MOST OF THOSE EAGLES, TOO, HAVE BEEN ETHEREAL.

The biggest thing Detroit is doing in a shipbuilding way is the Ford destroyers, officially known as the Eagle boats. Nothing like these boats has ever been built; I doubt if anything approaching the plant erected for their manufacture exists elsewhere. As I drove toward the glass-enclosed, gigantic structure, that somehow gives the impression of ethereal lightness and grace for all its straight lines and uncompromising angles, I could think of nothing but Keats's—

"Charmed magic casements opening on the foam
Of perilous seas in fairy lands forlorn."

True, the River Rouge is anything but "perilous seas." They had all but picked it up bodily and laid it aside, the day I was there, to give room for the dredges and pile drivers excavating the launching basin and building the permanent launching ways. There was the irresistible suggestion of magic, however, in the very thought that only a few months before these fields had indeed been "lands forlorn." Now thousands and before long tens of thousands of workers will be turning out Eagle boats, a ship a day.—Frank Parker Stockbridge in September, 1918, the World's Work.

Henry Ford's profit on his Eagle-boat contract with the Government may not be limited to \$1,200,000 on 60 completed Eagles—submarine chasers that will never part water above an enemy submarine—and \$300,000 to \$400,000, possibly more, on 40 more or less completed Eagles that the Navy will take off his hands. Detroit believes his possible ultimate acquisition of the big, new Eagle plant on the River Rouge, southwest of Detroit, may tower above all other phases of the entire Eagle-boat situation.

When Ford last winter undertook to build the Eagles, and incidentally revolutionize shipbuilding practice, the Navy agreed to advance funds for the construction of the plant. And it has done so, for the testimony of high naval officers before congressional committees is to the effect that Henry Ford has not put one penny of his own money into that 14-acre plant, while the Navy has put about \$3,500,000. It was quite obvious that with the termination of the Eagle contract the plant would be of no use whatsoever to the Navy. The site, owned by Ford, would be of no use to him with a Government-owned building on it, and vice versa. So provision for the future status of this \$3,500,000 plant was made in the Ford Motor Co.'s contract with the Navy. Clause 20 reads:

DETAILS OF APPRAISALS.

"Upon the completion of all the work under this contract, the compensation board shall appraise the then value to the contractor of the building, building slips, plant, and other facilities, the property of the United States and located in or upon the contractor's works. Such appraisals shall be made in two separate parts, the first including all buildings, building slips, and appurtenances not susceptible of removal without destruction; the second including plant and other facilities which are readily removable. In its appraisals the compensation board shall take account of the original costs as shown by the inventories herein provided for, and the costs in a normal material and labor market, and all the circumstances, such as the use made of the buildings, building slips, and nonremovable parts, and of the plant and other facilities during the life of the contract, the condition of business generally, the desirability to the contractor of the additional property and plant, the amount of depreciation due to wear and tear, and the replacement value at market prices at the time of appraisal. The department will furnish the contractor with copies of the appraisals upon completion. If the contractor shall accept such appraisals, or either of them, it shall repay to the United States such appraisal value under such terms and conditions as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy; but if the contractor shall refuse to pay the amount of the appraisals, or either of them, the department shall have the right to enter upon the contractor's works and remove such parts as, shall not have been accepted as are readily removable and to wreck such parts as are not susceptible of removal for their salvage value."

MAY GET EXCELLENT PLANT.

All of which means, Detroit believes, that when Henry Ford ceases building Eagles he will come into possession of a fine, large manufacturing plant, only one year or so old, 350 by 1,700 feet, covering about 14 acres, in close proximity to his proposed blast furnace and steel works development, at his own price. It is obvious, it is pointed out, that Ford will not take over the Eagle plant unless the price is "right," and the Navy is likely to be willing to accept even a fraction of a percentage of its cost or value rather than sustain an actual loss in wrecking it and removing the material. Ford has publicly stated: "As soon as we get through building Eagle boats for the Navy, I contemplate building a lot of canal barges." This is evidence that he does look forward to acquiring the Navy-built Eagle plant. Practically every adverse condition that would have a bearing upon the appraised price is met in this clause of the contract. It is believed, and Ford's advent as a canal-barge or tractor builder on the banks of the River Rouge may be just as propitious as his disposition in regard to the price of the plant dictates.

As regards payment for completed Eagles, the Ford Motor Co. contract is believed equally favorable to the contractor. Clause 11 of the contract reads:

"On completion of the trials above mentioned and when each vessel is substantially completed, except minor items of work that may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be left unfinished, the vessel shall be delivered, and shall thereupon be conditionally accepted, and the department shall take possession of the vessel and shall be responsible for the safety thereof, and payment of all money due under this contract shall be made, subject, however, to a special reserve therefrom of \$1,000, as provided for hereinafter."

ONLY \$1,000 HELD BACK.

This sum of \$1,000, the contract stipulates, shall be held for six months. Further along in the clause the contract states: "The fixed sum for profit shall be payable as follows: Ten thousand dollars shall be payable on each vessel as and when such vessel is half completed as certified by the inspectors, \$9,000 shall be payable when such vessel is preliminarily accepted, and the remaining \$1,000 to complete the \$20,000 profit payable on each vessel shall be held to constitute the special reserve provided for under the eleventh clause of this contract. Such payments for profit shall be payable on the monthly bills of actual cost when and as accrued."

Such is the financial arrangement under which the Ford Motor Co., of which Henry Ford is founder, president, and principal owner, undertook to build submarine-chasing Eagles for the United States Government. As German submarines were seeking to attack American troop ships, Henry Ford was declaring, in a signed magazine article, "Everything we are making for the Government will be made without profit." And under the contract which one of his vice presidents negotiated with the Navy, his company does not even have to wait until it turns over its product to the Government. It gets half of its \$20,000 profit when the Eagles are only half completed and \$9,000 more when the boats are turned over to the Navy. When an Eagle steams away from the River Rouge, accepted by the Navy, Henry Ford has \$19,000 of his \$20,000 profit in the bank, and the Government has \$1,000 to fall back on in case a structural defect crops out on a vessel that cost approximately \$400,000, so far as the Ford Motor Co.'s efforts are concerned. Henry Ford's self-styled war-work philanthropy does not prevent his company from compelling the Government to be a cash customer; his terms are cash in advance.

LIABILITY IS ONLY \$1,000.

Elsewhere in the contract it is stated that the contractor's collective liability "for breach of guaranties and agreements as to material, workmanship, and performance contained anywhere in this contract shall be limited to \$1,000 on each vessel, and the deductions therefor shall not in the aggregate exceed this amount." Thus the Ford Motor Co.'s liability on a \$400,000 boat is placed at \$1,000—one-fourth of 1 per cent of its hull and machinery cost.

In his contract with the Navy Henry Ford agreed to "use every endeavor to deliver the first of said vessels within five months of the date of this contract, 10 boats within one month thereafter, 20 boats within the next following month, and 25 boats a month thereafter." With the contract dated March 1, 1918, this called for the first vessel by August 1, 10 by September 1, 20 in September, and 25 a month, or 1 a day, each month thereafter. Actually, 7 Eagles had been completed by the first week of November, and of these 7 which were dispatched to the Atlantic before the St. Lawrence froze up, 6 were turned over in a far from complete condition. This is actual performance contrasted with contract, and, Detroit believes, stamps the Ford Motor Co. as the only big automotive interest of the great number there to fall down seriously in its war work.

Without the advance of one dollar from the Government, John F. and Horace E. Dodge erected a huge steel and concrete factory, 600 by 800 feet, costing approximately \$10,000,000, in which they manufactured the intricate recoil mechanisms for the 155-millimeter French howitzers and the 155-millimeter Filloux rifles at a rate never before approximated in the United States.

BUILT LIBERTY MOTORS.

The Lelands, Henry M. and his son, founded the great Lincoln Motor Co., which built Liberty motors. Fisher Body and Packard both did notable aircraft work. Henry Ford's Highland Park plant did commendable work on Liberty motors, ambulances, and tractors, but when his engineers attempted 204-foot ships, tiny in size as Navy craft go, they laid the fatal last straw upon the back of the organization that boasts it can develop films in rain water, can design a hospital far superior to the most expert physicians and surgeons, and proclaims it is the seventh heaven of all industrial efficiency and adaptability.

Detroit, his home city, looks upon whatever errors Henry Ford may be charged with as errors of omission. Despite the apparent wide gap between theory and practice as applied to his profits, Detroit believes he acted in good faith when he undertook to build the Eagles. The fact that he failed to turn out the boats as speedily as he planned is laid at the door of a lack of appreciation of the original magnitude of his task, the normal difficulties encountered in shipbuilding, and inability of his organization to adapt itself. The one big error of the entire matter, as Detroit sees it, is the one of commission on the part of the Navy in continuing the life of the contract for even the limited number of 60 Eagles.

The Eagles were designed solely for antisubmarine work, something the signing of the armistice disposed of. That such boats as the Eagles are of doubtful value as auxiliary craft, especially from cost of operation and maintenance, the Navy Department itself concedes. Whether such a craft, with a maximum draft of 8 feet and mounting two 4-inch and one 3-inch gun at a height of 20 feet and more above the water line, is really seaworthy has not yet been determined. The specially designed, Ford-built turbines have not been put to a real test as yet. All around, the Eagle type is of doubtful value, and as Rear Admiral Ralph Earle, Chief of Ordnance, for one, has stated publicly, the Navy in peace time would not consider building such craft. Henry Ford's finances are supposed to be sufficiently deep to cushion whatever shock would come from canceling the contract forthwith, a contingency provided for.

USES LABOR AND STEEL.

And still the Navy insists upon adhering to a project that will ultimately cost it more than \$50,000,000, with no adequate return in sight, and insists upon using valuable steel and labor on 100 per cent war work long after the war has ended—where England reduced war work to a minimum the day the armistice was signed. It insists on depleting the Treasury at the very time the country faces its most serious financial crisis and requires the saving of every cent possible. For ships, guns, anything that would aid in the prosecution of the war Great Lakes business interests stand willing to be taxed to the last dollar. But for the Navy to continue the construction of war-designed Eagle boats in peace time, especially in the light of the \$6,000,000,000 revenue bill pending, is beyond all understanding, these interests declare.

By way of "keeping books" on the Eagles, had the Navy Department done as Great Lakes industrial interests believe it should have done, and ordered work stopped on the Eagles November 12, as it could have done, the Navy would have had to pay:

For 7 completed Eagle boats, including hull and machinery, ordnance, profit, and alterations, approximately \$550,000 each, or a total of \$3,850,000;

For 24 Eagles, ranging from 40 to 75 per cent completed, actual cost plus 10 per cent profit; and

For material already worked up and equipment built or building for 69 Eagles, actual cost plus 10 per cent profit.

WHAT NAVY CONTEMPLATES.

But by continuing work on 60 Eagles and dropping only 40 the Navy faces this outlay:

For 60 completed Eagles, including hull and machinery, ordnance, and profit, approximately \$550,000 each, or a total of \$33,000,000; and

For material already worked up and equipment built or building for 40 Eagles, actual cost plus 10 per cent profit.

Just what the Navy could have saved for income-tax payers, bond and war stamp buyers by abandoning the Eagle program, paying Henry Ford his cost plus 10 per cent on all boats and equipment partially built and machinery completed or in process of manufacture, is next to impossible to determine. Probably the nearest approach to an estimate would be the difference between 7 complete Eagles and 60, or \$29,000,000, roughly.

Suffice it to say that the \$33,000,000 the Navy will pay for the 60 Eagles complete is but the first cost. The cost plus 10 per cent on the remaining 40 undoubtedly will run up to \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000. At \$9,000 a year, an Eagle, for maintenance of machinery, as estimated by Rear Admiral Robert S. Griffin, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, this one item alone would mount up to \$540,000 a year for the 60. In addition would be the cost of operation, the pay roll for 60 crews of 7 officers and 68 men each, and other expenses incidental to operation.

Fifty million dollars and more, then, including a round million and a half for their profit-decrying builder, is what Secretary Daniels purposes to pay for 60 fledgling and 40 still-hatched Eagles.

In scanning appropriations for the Navy Department, and more especially its proposed building program, the House Committee on Naval Affairs and its Subcommittee on Appropriations recently scratched the surface of the Ford Eagle case. By their own statements high officials of the department condemn the department's stand in insisting on the construction of 60 Eagles, or \$33,000,000 worth.

No room is left for hiding behind words in the testimony of Rear Admiral Ralph Earle, Chief of Ordnance, before the committee. Quizzed by members of the committee, he said, according to the official record:

Mr. KELLEY. Admiral, if these boats had not been started and if no contract had been given, would you make a new contract now for 100 boats of this type?

Admiral EARLE. You mean with no war on, sir?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; with the war over.

Admiral EARLE. No, sir.

Mr. KELLEY. You would not make it?

Admiral EARLE. No, sir.

Much the same stand was taken by Rear Admiral David W. Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair. Eagle boats are approximately the same size as the old, small type of destroyers, and the department now would not consider building such vessels, he pointed out. His testimony before the subcommittee was as follows:

Mr. BUTLER. Will you please tell me the purpose for which we will use these boats when the war is over—100 of these small boats?

Admiral TAYLOR. They are not such small boats. They are 500 tons, or practically 500 tons, displacement.

Mr. BUTLER. The size of the small destroyers which were put out?

Admiral TAYLOR. About the size of the older destroyers.

Mr. BUTLER. We do not build any more of them?

Admiral TAYLOR. No; we are building larger destroyers, but we have been using the small ones right along.

Mr. BUTLER. But, Admiral Taylor, we would not provide for any more small destroyers, would we?

Admiral TAYLOR. Hardly.

What is even more startling is that Navy officials frankly say they don't know why the department wants Eagle boats now that their submarine enemies are safely interned. Rear Admiral Robert S. Griffin, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, stated before the committee:

Mr. BROWNING. What do you want with the Eagle boats?

Admiral GRIFFIN. They are built for service against the submarines. Mr. BROWNING. I understand; but what do you want with the balance?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I do not know.

Indicative of the feeling among Congressmen that the Eagle boat program should have been cut short with the ending of the war and millions of dollars saved is the following statement from the committee's official record:

Mr. KELLEY. I can well understand how the Government might feel under obligation to save contractors from any harm, but if this is a type of boat that we would not ordinarily order, it would almost seem as though we ought to settle with Mr. Ford and not build them.

This at once precipitated queries as to the financial burden thrust upon Ford:

Mr. BROWNING. What expense did Mr. Ford go to in changing his plant to build these boats?

Admiral EARLE. Mr. Ford had no expense whatever in connection with them.

Mr. BROWNING. Do you mean there was no expense in changing the factory at all?

Admiral EARLE. No, sir; not to him.

Mr. BROWNING. Did the Government incur the expense?

Admiral EARLE. The Government did it all.

Mr. BROWNING. What did it cost?

Admiral EARLE. I have never seen that figure. The only reason, Mr. Butler, I knew that we were going to finish these boats was that in making up my revised estimates to submit to you I had to find out whether these boats were going to be finished or not, in order to keep that money in the ordnance estimates.

Mr. KELLEY. My question was simply asked to find out the admiral's personal opinion about the desirability of finishing 100 boats of this type.

Mr. BUTLER. And the admiral said to you that if he had it to do over again in peace time he would not order these boats.

Admiral EARLE. The destroyer is better and in every way more economical, I believe, for the Government to build.

That the Eagle boats are quite slow in comparison with other craft of a like nature the Navy now is building is shown by the following statement by Admiral Griffin:

Mr. KELLEY. What is the difference between these boats in construction and gunboats?

Admiral GRIFFIN. They are much lighter and carry a lighter battery.

Mr. KELLEY. These are lighter?

Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir; and their speed is more like that of a torpedo boat.

Mr. KELLEY. What is the speed?

Admiral GRIFFIN. About 18.5 knots.

Mr. KELLEY. What is the speed of the oldest destroyers?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I think they were intended for 28 knots.

Mr. KELLEY. These are very slow boats?

Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir; compared with those we are now building. So far as the Government is concerned the \$3,500,000 and more it has put into the Ford Eagle plant on the River Rouge is a total loss. This Admiral Griffin made clear, as follows:

Mr. BUTLER. Can you recall what disposition is to be made of this factory after the war is over?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I do not remember that. Most of the contracts that we have made—I think nearly all of them—are subject to an appraisal, after the completion of the contract, to be taken over by the contractor. I do not know whether that is in this one or not.

Mr. BUTLER. This plant will not be of a dollar's use to the Government after the boats are built, unless we build others?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I suppose not.

Mr. BUTLER. And we will lose everything?

Admiral GRIFFIN. We had to get somebody to build the boats. These boats were considered necessary to carry on the war, and the facilities for building them did not exist, and, as in a number of other cases, we had to build a plant for them.

Orders for 40 of the first 100 Eagles finally were canceled, but the machinery for the 40 built or building is good only for scrap. This is light on the contention of some Great Lakes shipbuilders that the Eagles should have been built as a unit for each boat instead of en bloc. In this connection Admiral Griffin has stated:

Mr. KELLEY. These engines which are being constructed for the Ford boats, will they be of value for other craft?

Admiral GRIFFIN. No. We would have to build the craft for them. That would be rather expensive.

Mr. KELLEY. You could not use the engines for any other boats?

Admiral GRIFFIN. No, sir.

Mr. BROWNING. And you could not use them for the tugs that you were speaking of—the mine sweepers?

Admiral GRIFFIN. No, sir.

On this subject Admiral Taylor also has added his opinion:

Admiral TAYLOR. * * * Hull material has been delivered practically entirely for all of the 112 boats, although there are a few items still remaining to be delivered on the last 12. So that the fabrication is practically three-quarters done.

Mr. BUTLER. What do you mean by "fabrication"?

Admiral TAYLOR. The working up of the material for the hulls in the ships, getting the plates, etc., ready to be assembled.

Mr. BUTLER. Could you use that material for any other purpose?

Admiral TAYLOR. It could be sold for scrap, but it has very little value for anything else. The plates come cut to shape and size, and when they are fabricated they have the holes punched in them, which practically destroys their value for any other purpose.

Mr. BUTLER. How about the engines for the boats?

Admiral TAYLOR. They might be put in—

Mr. BUTLER (interposing). Could anybody else use them for any purpose?

Admiral TAYLOR. Hardly, as they stand. These engines are specially built for these boats. They are geared down to the desired revolutions of the propeller of the boat.

To climax Congress's knowledge of the Eagle boats is the outright assertion of Admiral Griffin, in charge of the important Bureau of Steam Engineering, that it would be much cheaper to end construction immediately and pay Henry Ford his actual cost and 10 per cent profit on the completed boats than it will be to go through even with 60 Eagles and pay watchmen to stand guard over them. Not until the next war will the Eagles be needed, declared the admiral when quizzed by the committee:

Mr. BUTLER. If not kept in commission, they will rot out?

Admiral GRIFFIN. They will go to waste quickly.

Mr. BUTLER. And it will cost us money to keep them in commission?

Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not cheaper for us to let them go?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I doubt that. The state of completion is such that I doubt very much if we would save much by cutting off the contract.

Mr. BROWNING. The state of the Eagle boats?

Admiral GRIFFIN. Yes, sir. All of that material is on hand, practically fabricated; the boilers are well along, and the machinery generally is ahead of the hulls.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it not cheaper to stop and pay what we owe than it is to go ahead and complete these boats and tie them up somewhere and pay men to watch them?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I suppose it is.

Mr. BUTLER. We will not have any charge upon the Treasury hereafter if we stop these boats and pay the bill; we are through?

Admiral GRIFFIN. There will be no further expenditure.

Mr. BUTLER. If we are to have peace, we do not need the 112 Eagle boats?

Admiral GRIFFIN. I suppose not.

Mr. BUTLER. We will not need them until the next war?

Admiral GRIFFIN. No, sir.

WHAT OFFICIALS THINK OF EAGLES.

Asked if the \$3,500,000 Ford Eagle plant will be of not a dollar's use to the Government after the boats are built, Rear Admiral Griffin, Chief of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, answered, "I suppose not."

To the question, "If these boats had not been started and no contract given, would you make a new contract for 100 boats of this type?" Rear Admiral Earle, Chief of Ordnance, replied, "No, sir."

Questioned whether Henry Ford went to any expense to build the Eagle boats, Admiral Earle said, "The Government did it all."

Said Congressman KELLEY, of the House Committee on Naval Affairs: "It would almost seem as though we ought to settle with Mr. Ford and not build them."

NAVY KEPT CONVICTS OFF EAGLES.

Henry Ford's trust in ex-convicts, pardoned criminals, workhouse and stone-pile labor, and the like evidently is not shared by the Navy Department. The Ford Motor Co.'s contract with the Navy Department specifically says:

"In the performance of this contract no person shall be employed that is under sentence of imprisonment at hard labor."

Prison stripes were not meant to be the camouflage design of Eagle boats!

[From the Daily Iron Trade and Metal Market Report, Cleveland, Ohio, Dec. 31, 1918.]

EAGLE CONTRACT CALLED FAULTY—HENRY FORD'S PROFIT ASSURED, WITH PRACTICALLY NO SAFEGUARD FOR GOVERNMENT AGAINST EXCESSIVE CONSTRUCTION COSTS—IS HELD TO BE WASTEFUL—NAVAL OFFICERS ADMIT "BOGEY" COST OF \$275,000 WAS NEVER EXPECTED TO BE MET—WHAT OFFICERS THINK OF FORD MOTOR CO.—ELEMENTS OF COST GIVEN—SCHEDULE SHOWS WHAT FORD WAS TO BILL NAVY AS ACTUAL EXPENSES INCURRED AT \$3,500,000 RIVER ROGUE PLANT.

[This is the fourth and last of a series of articles on the Eagle boats—steel, 204-foot submarine chasers Henry Ford undertook last March to build for the Navy. Though he proclaimed he would build them at the rate of one a day, Ford completed only seven in time to get them to the Atlantic Ocean before the St. Lawrence froze this month. The Navy is insisting on going through with 60 of these \$550,000 vessels, though all need for them ceased when hostilities came to an end Nov. 11.]

Government contracts such as the Navy Department negotiated with the Ford Motor Co. for the construction of the Eagle boats do not properly conserve the public interest, because their fixed-profit provisions fail to penalize for excessive costs.

This is the opinion of a lawyer, known equally well in Washington, New York, and Cleveland, who is regarded as a most astute man. Years of experience in contracting have convinced him of the folly of entering into such pacts.

"Henry Ford's Eagle contract assures him a profit of \$20,000 a boat utterly regardless of what the boats cost," declares this man. "Further, it is stipulated that in case the actual cost of an Eagle falls below \$275,000 Ford is to share 25 per cent of the saving."

NO CHECK ON EXTRAVAGANCE.

"On the face of it such a contract is not mutual. The contractor is guaranteed a premium for economy, but the Government is not protected if the contractor exceeds the estimate. Consider this in the light that at all times it was not believed the Eagles could be built for as little as \$275,000."

"Such contracts are wasteful of the Government's money. Not alone in the Ford Eagle case, but in a great many others the facts have been that the Government put up or paid for the plant, is paying the contractor a guaranteed profit regardless of the cost, at the end the contractor will take over the plant dirt cheap and what is as probably most valuable—he will have acquired invaluable experience in a new line of work."

WHAT TAYLOR SAID.

Applying this directly in the case of Henry Ford's Eagles, statements by Rear Admiral David W. Taylor, Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, are most enlightening. This question was put to the admiral:

"In regard to these Eagle boats, you said that Mr. Ford had estimated that he could build them for \$275,000 apiece, and you think, as I take it, that they will probably cost \$400,000. There is a difference of \$125,000. What, in your opinion, caused that serious mistake of judgment?"

To this Admiral Taylor replied:

"I do not think the Ford people who made this figure had had sufficient experience to estimate the cost. They had no experience in shipbuilding. The 'bogey' cost of \$275,000 inserted in the contract was not a binding estimate in any way."

Admiral Taylor has further stated that "I think if the cost of the hull and machinery comes below \$400,000 it will be a very creditable performance."

ESTIMATE WAY LOW.

What is held up as a spur to Henry Ford to build the Eagles as cheaply as possible on the face of it is not worth the paper it is written on apparently, for the very testimony of a high naval officer is that to build them for \$125,000 more than the "bogey" cost would be a "very creditable performance."

And the Ford Motor Co., a company that "had no experience in shipbuilding," one that did not have "sufficient experience to estimate the cost" was the Navy's choice of a builder for 112 Eagles costing \$550,000 complete, or \$61,600,000 worth of boats. At the Navy's request this company is continuing to build 60 Eagles, at a cost of \$33,000,000, although they have never been actually tried out, in the face of the admission of the Navy Department itself that the Eagles will not be needed "until the next war."

SCHEDULE SHOWS COSTS.

Attached to the body of the Ford Motor Co.'s contract with the Navy Department is the following schedule of the elements of actual cost for which Henry Ford is to be paid. It is noted that "the following schedule shall be considered as an amplification of the definitions of cost contained in this contract, but shall not be construed as an exhaustive enumeration of the elements of actual cost."

A. OVERHEAD.

The elements defined below shall be included under overhead:

1. Indirect material: This shall include such materials as are used in the process of manufacture, but either do not enter into the product or else enter it in such manner as not to be conveniently chargeable to any particular produce.

2. Packing and packing supplies: This shall include boxes, lumber, nails, containers, strapping, and miscellaneous packing supplies, and the labor used in connection with the work of packing.

3. Indirect labor: This shall include labor not expended directly on the product, but which is nevertheless required to be performed in connection with the manufacture of the product. Labor of packing shall be included hereunder. Examples: Repairing, handling, trucking, sweeping, etc.

4. Experimental work: Only experimental work directly necessary in connection with the contract and not otherwise expressly paid for shall be includable, except small residual expenses for general experimentation which it is impracticable to allocate distinctly.

5. Repairs: Includable here are costs for such repairs only as are currently made to provide for ordinary regular upkeep of plant, which costs are a usual and fairly consistent annual charge.

6. Administrative expenses: Only that portion of general administrative expense which is applicable to Government work may be included hereunder. Such applicability, rather than the character of the service received for these expenses, shall constitute the test of inclusion hereunder.

7. Employees' welfare: Includable under this element are the following items:

(a) Wages paid employees while absent on account of sickness.

(b) Vacation allowances to wage earners.

(c) Net cost of operation and maintaining plant hospitals, expenditures for hospitals and other organizations to cover definite benefits to employees, and expenses for medicines and supplies for aid to the injured.

(d) Payments according to a definite pension plan to disabled and veteran employees or their families not covered by liability insurance or other items herein mentioned.

(e) Net cost of operating the contractor's restaurants.

(f) Expenses in connection with other general forms of employees' welfare work.

8. Taxes: Tax accruals during the period of the contract shall be included in overhead, except that Federal income, Federal excess or war profits taxes, and Federal taxes of the same economic character shall not be included in cost.

9. Insurance: Accrued insurance premiums on the contractor's property, on his interest in others' property used in connection with the contract, and for liability insurance (whether payable to insurance companies, State compensation boards, or under independent insurance plans not materially exceeding in cost the first two methods mentioned) shall be includable hereunder. Insurance on the vessels shall be charged to the vessels.

10. Rent: Rental payments made by the contractor shall be analyzed between (a) interest on investment and (b) repairs, depreciation, insurance, taxes, maintenance, and service expense. Only that portion covering items includable under (b) shall be allowed in actual cost.

11. House service and power plant: Includable hereunder are the proper proportions of the expense of keeping the buildings of the contractor, used in connection with the contract, cleaned, heated, lighted, supplied with elevator and other services necessary to render the same a fit place to work in, and also the proper proportion of the power plant operating expenses.

12. Excluded elements: Interest, advertising, collection expense, credit losses, and financing costs shall not be included in overhead or elsewhere.

B. DEPRECIATION.

1. Repairs and alterations of a general nature which are necessary only at intervals of more than a year, or replacements and unusual repairs which would involve a significant increase in expenses shall not be considered as expense, but shall apply against the reserve established for depreciation.

2. Jigs, etc.: Small tools, jigs, dies, patterns, machine-tool fixtures, and other appliances of the same general nature, when exclusively provided and adapted for making the work herein contracted for, shall be depreciated 100 per cent or charged to the cost of the vessels.

C. ELEMENTS CAPABLE OF ALTERNATIVE TREATMENT.

1. Freight, cartage, and express (inward), etc.: Where the inclusion of the above in direct material costs is impracticable they may be included in overhead. Same principle shall apply in case of duties and import expenses.

2. Wastage and corrective labor: In addition to normal wastage, scrap, and collective labor under usual manufacturing conditions, all excessive wastage, scrap, and corrective labor incident to work under existing abnormal conditions which could not have been avoided by the exercise of reasonable care and good faith shall be included in actual cost, either with direct material or direct labor or under overhead.

3. Discounts: Trade discounts and discounts for prompt payment, unless the contractor, though exercising reasonable care and business skill shall have been unable to take the same, shall not be included in the amounts to which the contractor is entitled to be reimbursed and shall either be deducted from material costs or eliminated in such manner as the compensation board may direct.

D. ROYALTY.

Any royalty or payment that the contractor may be obliged to assume or pay for the use of any patent rights in connection with the production of articles contracted for shall be included in actual cost.

E. MISCELLANEOUS CREDITS TO COST.

Miscellaneous items of revenue accruing to the contractor in connection with the present contract shall be credited to actual cost.

F. RULES AND PRINCIPLES FOR COMPUTING AMOUNTS ALLOWABLE FOR COST ELEMENTS.

1. Salaries and wages: Neither excessive salaries nor excessive compensation of any kind shall be allowed.

2. Scrap and waste credits: The salvage value of scrap and waste shall be deducted, either from material cost or from overhead.

3. Direct material costs: In determining direct material costs, actual prices paid shall be used; where this is impracticable, use fair average prices. In case the material used shall be from contractor's stores purchased prior to contract apply the same principles.

4. Depreciation: The rate and amount of depreciation allowed shall be arrived at by a consideration of the following factors:

- (a) Nature, construction, and condition of buildings and equipment.
- (b) Deterioration of plant and machinery due to wear and tear.
- (c) Amount spent for maintenance in the way of repairs and renewals.
- (d) The invention of new methods or new machines which may or may not entirely replace the old ones.
- (e) Permanency of business and likelihood of increase or decrease in the same.
- (f) Amounts previously written off for depreciation.
- (g) Other factors, such as peculiar and excessive uses of machines, rate of production, idleness of plant.

ARTICLE BY ERVING WINSLOW.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD a very short note of Mr. Erving Winslow, of the city of Boston, State of Massachusetts, together with a one-page article written by him to one of the papers of that State, entitled "Anarchy." I ask it because it is, in part, an answer to certain matter which has been inserted in the RECORD by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE ANTI-IMPERIALIST LEAGUE,
New Haven, Conn., January 4, 1919.

The Hon. J. S. WILLIAMS.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: Loyal to the President in my humble way, as you are in your great office, I want to ask you to have this condensed epitome printed in the RECORD, as your California colleague has caused to be done with Russian matter which interests him. If you can not, please put your frank upon envelope for return, as I have no other copy.

Wishing you health and peace for the New Year,

I am, faithfully, yours,

ERVING WINSLOW.

[From the New Haven Journal-Courier, Jan. 4.]

ANARCHY.

NEW HAVEN, January 2, 1919.

There is certainly ground for much apprehension of "old-fashioned," selfishly inspired adjustments dictated by the big nations on top to weaker ones at their mercy. But while hydra-headed Scylla may swoop down from above and hinder the wayfarer's progress to his goal, the whirlpool of Charybdis yawns below, to engulf its victims in the maelstrom from which the high gods can not rescue them.

Anarchy is the most serious menace of the day, though so little mentioned. It may be an instinctive feeling that its mention is going to encourage it which induces as a measure of safety such an "ostrich policy." But the "internationale" has its own propaganda, wireless and underground, and, smoldering, spreads like a forest fire. We are told that the use of force to suppress it is only going to fan it into a hot flame. There is one obvious weapon against it which is in the hands of America to-day. It is the relief of that suffering for necessities which supplies now the fuel. While this would win away that peasantry who have found that their present leaders have failed to fulfill their promises, it would enable the representatives of an "orderly democracy" to impress its example on the proletariat. It is among the people of the great country which was such a heroic sufferer in the war against a common enemy that this double mission should be undertaken, challenging not nor recognizing any "government." The peasantry themselves would soon furnish a bulwark against any interference, which might be avoided at first by a small protective force. If the former subjects of the German Emperor seek to evade their responsibility by taking up the "Soviet" principles, they can not share in such consideration due the misled Russian people. On the contrary, the forces of the United States may have to be employed against those who, under whatever name, must remain a conquered enemy, held to solidarity as such, for the repayments and restitutions demanded. Our action as

outlined to Russia would also prove to the anarchistic, restless spirit among ourselves and in the allied countries that democracy means brotherhood, cooperation, opportunity.

The equality of the powers of the great States is important, but the paramount issue to be declared at the council is the "Wilsonian" issue—the establishment of our democracy, which is that of the British Empire, containing as it does a regenerative power—and the denunciation of the heresy of the terror as it exists and threatens to expand, and of the heresiarachs among the civilized nations who would foment it in class warfare.

ERVING WINSLOW.

SALARIES OF JUDGES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12001) to amend an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report (No. 635) thereon.

SITES FOR MILITARY HOSPITALS.

Mr. HARDWICK. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 386, submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] on December 14, 1918, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the selection and acquisition of sites for military hospitals, and contracts and expenditures for the repair, acquisition, and construction of such hospitals; also what additional hospital facilities are required and what existing public buildings, if any, are available for use as hospitals.

ALMA HARRIS.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 4240) for the relief of Alma Harris, and I submit a report (No. 634) thereon. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill.

I can state to the Senate just what the report is. There was an entrywoman in southern New Mexico who made an entry upon public land and was prevented from residing upon the land by reason of the unlawful incursions of the people from old Mexico. This matter was favorably recommended by the Department of the Interior and was incorporated in an omnibus bill which has already passed the Senate, but a bill has passed the House giving relief in this special case, and I ask the passage of the bill by the Senate so as to consummate the relief which has been asked for and recommended by the Department of the Interior.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there was so much confusion in the Chamber at the time the Senator made the statement in regard to this bill that I was unable to hear the facts; but I am constitutionally opposed to authorization to issue patents for lands without compliance with the law, and I should like to ask the Senator upon what grounds this request is being made.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The facts in the case are stated fully in a letter from the Secretary of the Interior to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands of the House. This entrywoman was driven from the land by people from old Mexico during the rebellion down there, and it was only because of the rebellion in Mexico that this entrywoman was prevented from actually residing upon the land during the period required by the law. There is no question about the facts in the matter. She went upon the land and did everything to comply with the law until she was driven off—actually driven out of her home by bandits from old Mexico. The Secretary of the Interior so reports, and recommends the passage of this bill. I will state to the Senator that this relief was embodied in an omnibus bill which has already passed the Senate and is now in the House; but the House passed a bill giving specific relief in this case, and I am simply asking the Senate to do in this form what it has already done in another bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to Alma Harris for the southeast quarter section 12, township 29 south, range 7 west, New Mexico principal meridian, in the Las Cruces land district, New Mexico, upon payment of the lawful purchase price of said land, without further proof of compliance with law.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROCK RIVER BRIDGE, WIS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 5192) for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Jackson Street, in the city of Janesville, Wis., and I submit a report

(No. 633) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I should like to offer just a formal amendment to the bill, to correct a description of the location of the bridge.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin offers an amendment which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On line 7, before the word "Jackson," insert the word "South," and in the same line, after the word "Janesville," strike out the words "crosses the" and insert "connects with."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS IN ALASKA.

Mr. SMOOT. By the Committee on Appropriations I am directed to report back favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 199) for relief in Alaska. As this is an emergency matter, I ask for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the joint resolution.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out all after the resolving clause and to insert:

That to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion and under his direction, with the advice and cooperation of the Public Health Service, to combat the influenza in Alaska and to afford relief to the indigent natives thereof, including expenses already incurred for this purpose, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, before the joint resolution is taken up for consideration I should like to know something about how it is expected to reach the situation and how much of this \$100,000 will ever get to its destination by reason of the conditions which surround the situation. I should like to know how we are to get into the different parts of Alaska at this time and what are the details of the methods by which this scheme is to be effected.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Idaho that the governor of Alaska was before the committee on yesterday, when he outlined the serious situation existing in Alaska not only among the white people but among the Indians as well, on account of the prevalence of the influenza, which has been raging there for some time. In some places, it was testified to by the governor, that as high as 50 per cent of the Indians have died from the effects of the influenza.

The revenues of Alaska are very limited, indeed, and the governor feels that the only way that this dread disease can be successfully coped with is by assistance from the Federal Government. The governor asked for \$200,000.

Mr. BORAH. I know generally the situation which prevails in Alaska and its seriousness, but I want to know something about the method by which it is proposed to deal with the matter. How is it proposed to take hold of it, and who is going to administer this fund? It is easy to appropriate, but I should like to know something of its use.

Mr. SMOOT. The fund is to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior with the assistance of the Public Health Service. They will, of course, direct physicians who are now in Alaska to go to different parts of Alaska and to do everything possible to overcome this dread disease.

I desire to say to the Senator from Idaho that a great deal of this money will be used for help particularly in the way of food, clothing, medical assistance, and medicine for the Indians.

I desire to say also that in one district of Alaska there are now 90 motherless and fatherless children, made orphans through the death of their parents from influenza. Those orphans have been provided for, the governor of the Territory having made a contract that they shall be taken care of at \$10 per month per capita. The governor has already authorized expenditures to the amount of \$107,000. He also testified that even to carry on the work which had been undertaken it will take another \$50,000, or at least \$43,000 more, to provide funds for that purpose until the time of the meeting of the Territorial legislature.

It is for this reason, Mr. President, that the committee voted that the joint resolution should be favorably reported, reduced, however, to the amount of \$100,000.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand perfectly the necessity of doing this work; but Congress is in the habit of voting large sums of money here without any check or any knowledge of the plan by which that money is to be expended. The result is that we get very little effect from our efforts to accomplish anything along this line.

As an illustration, Mr. President, while I am on my feet, I desire to say that the President sent a message here a few days ago asking us to appropriate \$100,000,000 with which to feed the people of Europe. If there is no more information as to where that money is going and how it is going to be expended than is incorporated in the President's message, I for one shall not vote for any such appropriation. We are entitled to know to whom that appropriation is going, what particular people in Europe are to be fed, and, particularly, the plans and methods by which it is proposed to take care of the situation. I shall not myself vote to simply turn over \$100,000,000 to be administered by the food department as it has administered food affairs in this country. I want it, therefore, to be understood that when the Appropriations Committee brings in legislation for the appropriation of this \$100,000,000 that it must bring in detailed facts as to how the money is to be expended and where it is going. I want security for its repayment, and I want to know if our associates, England and France, are going to cooperate. I want, also, some one made responsible, who will account in detail as to how the money is expended. If we are going to feed Europe, which I do not admit, we must do it in a business way, for the American taxpayer has about reached his limit.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator from Idaho, I desire to say that I am positive that the Appropriations Committee of the Senate is not going to report in favor of the appropriation of \$100,000,000 for the feeding of the starving people of Europe unless they do have more information than they have in their possession to-day. I will assure the Senator from Idaho of that fact.

Mr. BORAH. There is a vast amount of comfort in that assurance.

Mr. SMOOT. I desire to say in relation to the \$100,000 that is proposed to be appropriated for Alaska that the governor of Alaska gave a description of how the \$107,000 heretofore expended had been apportioned. In the Nome district, I think, there was apportioned about \$20,000; in the smaller districts in Alaska there had been apportioned in some \$2,000, in others \$3,000, and in others \$5,000. The \$107,000 covered the amount of the expenditures up to the time that the governor had received the last report.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. The sum of \$1,000,000 has heretofore been appropriated for the suppression of the influenza. Has the Senator from Utah any statement as to what disposition was made of that money and whether any of that sum remains available for expenditure in Alaska?

Mr. SMOOT. The \$1,000,000 which was appropriated by Congress for the purpose to which the Senator from Virginia alludes has been expended with the exception of about \$135,000. It is true that a part of that \$1,000,000 went to Alaska.

Mr. SWANSON. How much of it went to Alaska?

Mr. SMOOT. Gen. Blue, of the Public Health Service, stated to the committee that he did not know just exactly the amount that had been sent to Alaska, but the amount sent there had been used for the purpose of paying physicians who had been sent into different parts of Alaska. He stated that he had not received the last report, and therefore could not say just what amount had been sent to Alaska.

Mr. SWANSON. About how much was it?

Mr. SMOOT. It was a very small percentage of the \$865,000 already expended.

Mr. SWANSON. For what is it proposed to use this \$100,000—to send physicians to Alaska?

Mr. SMOOT. It is to be used to furnish the necessities of life, I will say to the Senator from Virginia, to Indians in certain parts of Alaska, and also to send medicine and physicians into affected districts and see what can be done to control the epidemic.

Mr. SWANSON. Has the Territorial government of Alaska any funds which can be used for this purpose?

Mr. SMOOT. No funds have been appropriated for the purpose. I want the Senate to understand the full conditions. The Territory of Alaska has about \$600,000 in its treasury, or it had about that amount or a little more than that amount a year.

ago, and about the same amount to-day. The governor of Alaska stated that that \$600,000 had been collected by taxation and is held in the treasury for the purpose of building roads and making improvements in different parts of Alaska, which are absolutely necessary.

Mr. SWANSON. Now, I should like to ask the Senator this question: If Congress should authorize the expenditure of \$100,000 out of that fund in the treasury of Alaska for this purpose, could the money be made immediately available?

Mr. SMOOT. No; Congress could not do that, and the money could not be taken out of the treasury of Alaska until after the Territorial legislature meets in Alaska.

I will say to the Senator from Virginia that the \$107,000 that has already been apportioned in Alaska has been so apportioned upon the responsibility of the governor. He has no authority by law to take such action, but we, of course, all know that the legislature, when it meets, will see that the governor is held harmless so far as any loss is concerned.

Mr. SWANSON. As I understand, the Legislature of Alaska, without any authorization from Congress, could appropriate out of this \$600,000 ample funds with which to take care of the situation?

Mr. SMOOT. The Legislature of Alaska can do that, Mr. President.

Mr. SWANSON. The only question, then, is as to whether the sum shall be appropriated by the Federal Government or by the Territorial government of Alaska?

Mr. SMOOT. That is the only question which is involved.

Mr. SWANSON. Is this money to be reimbursed under this joint resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. No, this is not reimbursable; it is a direct appropriation to Alaska.

Mr. SWANSON. Does the Senator from Utah object to having it made reimbursable?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to state why I am in favor of this direct appropriation of \$100,000. We all know the situation in Alaska. Nearly all of the public lands in Alaska have been withdrawn, and the principal source of taxation is the imposition of a tax upon the business interests of Alaska. In other words, of the million dollars collected by taxation in Alaska, half of it comes from the salmon packers alone. No taxes can be collected from the public land, and over 99 per cent of the lands of Alaska are public lands, and a great proportion of these lands are withdrawn from entry. Therefore Alaska is restricted in her power to collect taxes. That being the case, it seemed, at least to a majority of the committee, that in the face of such an epidemic as is now raging in Alaska—and the second outbreak is already on—it is about as little as could possibly be done to give Alaska \$100,000 to assist in overcoming the epidemic.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator at that point that only one-fiftieth of 1 per cent of the territory of Alaska is in private ownership and subject to taxation.

Mr. SMOOT. I think that is absolutely true, Mr. President. Indeed, I hardly thought the amount in private ownership was that much.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KING. I did not hear all that the senior Senator from Utah said, but I wish to inquire whether or not this epidemic is raging among the Indians who are in tribal relations, who have a right to look to the Government for protection and whose interests the Government ought to care for? If any of them are Indians in tribal relations, there is some sort of obligation upon the Government to care for them.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the governor of Alaska stated that 90 per cent of the cases of influenza were among the Indians. I wish to say to the Senator that I was surprised to learn that there are no Indians in Alaska who have had citizenship conferred upon them. They are not even as well off in that respect as many of the Indians within the continental boundaries of the United States, and it seems to me that \$100,000—as I have heretofore said, \$200,000 was asked for—ought to be expended by the Government to combat this dread disease. It is true that we appropriated a million dollars, as has already been stated, to combat the influenza epidemic generally, but very little of that million dollars found its way to Alaska.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah tell me the number of Indians in Alaska?

Mr. SMOOT. There are 27,000 Indians in Alaska, and there are only 20,000 white people there; in other words, there are only 47,000 souls in Alaska to-day. Six years ago there were

50,000 white people in Alaska, but within six years the white population of Alaska has decreased from 50,000 to 20,000.

Mr. SHAFROTH. This is due, Mr. President, to our policy started about 12 years ago with relation to reserving the lands and natural resources of Alaska.

Mr. BORAH. Not wholly, Mr. President; that is a very bad feature of it; but it will transpire in due time that that is not the sole reason for the depopulation of Alaska.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I was going to make the same statement the Senator from Idaho has just made.

Mr. President, I do not know that there is anything more to say in regard to this matter. I think I have covered the situation pretty thoroughly.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I merely wish to say a word. I am not going to try to amend the joint resolution. I think, however, that the provision it makes, upon the part of Congress, is very niggardly, in view of the situation in Alaska. There ought to be appropriated at least \$150,000 to take care of the situation, but the committee has decided that \$100,000 was all that it would recommend.

The conditions are simply deplorable. A large part of this money will go to taking care of homeless and orphaned children, made orphans by this dread disease. There may not so much of it go to actually combating the disease itself; but at one place, as the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has stated, one-half of the natives have died. That leaves many orphaned children, who will simply starve unless they are taken care of. The white people of that Territory ought not to have the burden imposed upon them of taking care of these Indians, who are really wards of the Government, any more than the people of a State should have the burden of taking care of the Indians within that State imposed upon them. This is not done in the case of the States. The Government takes care of Indians within their boundaries; we recognize them as wards of the National Government, as they are, and the Indians, the Aleuts, and other natives in Alaska are in the same way wards of the Government.

Of course it is very much more expensive to afford relief in that Territory than within the borders of the United States proper, and, as I have said, I think the amount provided is very niggardly. I am not, however, going to try to amend the joint resolution in the hope that we can put it through promptly and possibly get more somewhere else.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5283) granting a pension to Edwin W. Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CUMMINS:

A bill (S. 5284) to amend section 10 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5285) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5286) directing the payment of certain sums to fourth-class postmasters for rent, light, and fuel; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 5287) to provide for the control, supervision, and operation of telegraph, telephone, marine cable, and radio systems; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of South Carolina:

A bill (S. 5288) to provide transportation, storage, and marketing facilities for, and to regulate the commerce among the

States in, live stock, meats, and other products derived from live stock or the slaughtering of live stock; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

A bill (S. 5289) to amend paragraph 5 of section 5 of the United States cotton-futures act, approved August 11, 1916, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 5290) for the investigation and extermination of the European corn borer; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. SMITH of Georgia:

A bill (S. 5291) to repeal section 7 of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5292) making it unnecessary to secure permits from the United States Shipping Board for the construction of ships in American shipyards for foreign account; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 5293) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim D. Edwards (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5294) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Truesdale (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 5295) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Orange, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 5296) for the suitable recognition of war workers who have during the existing war donated or virtually donated their services to the United States Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 5297) for the naming of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLIS:

A bill (S. 5298) granting a pension to Della J. Nash; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 5299) granting a pension to Jacob A. Booher; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 5300) providing for a reclamation project on the Strawberry River, Duchesne County, Utah, to be known as the Castle Peak reclamation project; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands.

A bill (S. 5301) to extend the franking privilege to the State Council of Defense of Utah; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 5302) granting a pension to Ella B. Kean (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5303) to permit joining the United States of America as a party defendant in an action in Federal and State courts in certain actions affecting title to real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5304) to authorize the Federal courts of the United States to render declaratory judgments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 5305) to stimulate the production, sale, and distribution of live stock and live-stock products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. GORE:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 208) providing that one term of the United States District Court for the Eastern Judicial District of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for reading and reference to the Interstate Commerce Committee. In that connection I desire to say that it is in substance a bill which I introduced about a month ago. It contains some modifications, however, and I thought this was the best way in which to make them. I ask for its reference to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The bill (S. 5284) to amend section 10 of an act "to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal

control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

CABLE SERVICE.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce. I think, in fairness to myself, I ought to have an opportunity for about five minutes to explain the nature of the bill and why it has been introduced. I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to read this bill. It is a bill to provide for the control, supervision, and operation of telegraph, telephone, marine cable, and radio systems.

The bill has not received by myself that consideration which I should wish to give to such a bill if it were to be reported for passage. In fact, I am not willing to say that I would give my support to all of the provisions of the bill. I should wish to hear from the Postmaster General and the various experts of the systems to be affected and representatives of the public before I could make up my mind definitely; but I thought, as the subject was before the Senate, it was well to introduce the bill so that it might receive the careful consideration of the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Some provisions of the bill I have introduced by request, one of them which I should like to mention later.

The bill, in a general way, places all of the telegraph, telephone, cable, and radio systems under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission. I might say that they are already under the control of the commission; but this bill seeks to extend that control, so as to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power to fix not only maximum but minimum rates, to control service, and to compel interchange of business and use of facilities. In other words, it extends the power of the commission over the service as well as the rates. It also gives the commission the power to control the issue of all stocks, bonds, and securities of these companies engaged in interstate commerce.

It is not necessary to stop to discuss that; but the necessity for some Federal control of the issuance of stock and securities, I think, has developed to the satisfaction of all thinking men on this subject, not only as to railroads, but as to the other great public utilities of the country. It will avoid "wild-cat" or reckless financiering, and it will make such securities better investments for the people and a safer basis on which to regulate or fix public charges. It will, in a general way, prohibit the issue of stock without its being fully paid, and it authorizes the commission to fix the conditions under which other securities may be issued and regulates the commissions and discounts, and so forth.

The second and a most important section authorizes the commission to permit consolidations to any extent the commission may think wise for the public interests. In other words, if any companies wish to consolidate their lines or companies where they were competing, which would be in violation of the Sherman Act, they must present to the Interstate Commerce Commission a petition showing the public convenience, necessity, and public interest; and the commission, after a public hearing, may permit such consolidation, in part or in whole, and on such terms or conditions as it may see fit.

I realize that this is an exceedingly important provision, and to some extent it reverses a policy which has been in existence heretofore in this country. I am not standing here now as an advocate of it. I simply suggest it, because it is one of the things we must consider.

I shall not stop to discuss the pros and cons of this question, but I think it is evident to everyone that of the 8,000 or 10,000 telephone companies scattered over this country many of them could be consolidated with advantage to the public, and their service made interchangeable. I do not believe anybody claims that there is any such thing as competition in the telephone business. Only one telephone can be used at a time; and in those communities where two or three telephone companies are operating there is two or three times the usual expense and annoyance to the patrons; but if that is done, of course the commission must have power over service in order to protect the public.

I shall not go further than simply suggest this. To a certain extent the same thing occurs in the telegraph and in the cable systems; but there are many very important questions there which I think the committee should consider, as to whether the competition now existing is of sufficient importance that Con-

gress should prohibit any consolidation. I think that is a question that should be looked into very carefully.

I am not going to discuss this bill at length. The last section of the bill I introduce by request. I think it is fair to state that I am not yet prepared to say that I would be in favor of it. I think it is a question that the committee and the Congress should look into carefully. I am told that certain of our cable systems should be extended at once, in order to connect with valuable territory, especially in Brazil, and protect the commerce and trade of this country in South America; that it is necessary that the cable go in advance of the steamship and the merchant; and that, owing to the fact that the Government occupies the entire field of investment at present, the companies have been unable to procure capital. It is therefore recommended that the Government authorize a temporary loan on security in order to encourage cable extensions, but upon condition that the cable be manufactured in this country.

I am not prepared to say whether that is advisable or necessary. One of the companies reaching South America—the Central & South American Telegraph Co., I think its name is—claims that it has sufficient capital to go ahead with extensions.

One other company claims temporarily it can not get the capital. I do not think any Government aid is needed for any great length of time, and I am not sure that it is needed at all; but it is a question which I think should be carefully considered, because there is no doubt that the demands of the Government and the business interests of this country require the extension of cable systems.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I was delayed and came in late. Do I understand that the Senator is now discussing the resolution which he introduced the other day?

Mr. KELLOGG. No; I am not asking to take up that resolution, and I would like to have it lie on the table at least for the present.

I only wish to say one more word.

I may be overenthusiastic about the subject, but with a foreign commerce which last year amounted to over \$9,000,000,000—the largest foreign commerce, by several billions, that any country ever had in any period of history—with a balance of trade in our favor of over \$3,000,000,000—in other words, our exports exceeded our imports by over \$3,000,000,000—with the war ended, and being confronted with the increasing competition of other nations, I think it is due the business interests and the people of this country that every effort be made to extend and protect our foreign commerce in South America and, in fact, in all other countries. The telegraph and the cable must precede the steamship; the steamship must accompany the merchant; the banking system must combine with both; and those are the great facilities which our business men need in the development and holding of this foreign commerce.

I have introduced this bill hoping that the Interstate Commerce Committee would, as soon as possible, bring before it the men who have more knowledge upon that subject than I have, that we might consider this most important question.

The bill (S. 5287) to provide for the control, supervision, and operation of telegraph, telephone, marine cable, and radio systems was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MEAT-PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Some days ago I introduced, by request, a bill relative to the packing houses. The bill had been introduced in the House by Mr. SIMS, of Tennessee; and I was requested by representatives of the Farmers' Alliance to introduce it in the Senate, because there is to be held here this week a national convention of farmers from all over the country, and they desire to be heard before some committee on this bill. These representatives would have to come many hundreds of miles if the hearings should not take place about the same time in the House and in the Senate. The bill went to the Interstate Commerce Committee in the House. Knowing that to be the fact, I did not feel like asking that it should go to the Agricultural Committee of the Senate, at least in the absence of the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee, so it went to the Interstate Commerce Committee.

A few days ago I asked unanimous consent that that committee be discharged from the consideration of this bill and that it go to the Agricultural Committee. I was requested by the Senator from Utah to postpone that request, and I make the request now. I want to say that I talked with the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee at that time, and he seemed to have no objection to it, nor did the ranking mem-

ber of the minority. That committee is burdened with hearings on the railroad question and can not hear witnesses and can not give consideration to this bill for a long while. The Agricultural Committee has been considering the question of some bill with reference to the packers, and has had some hearings upon the question; so that it would be entirely appropriate that this bill should go to the Agricultural Committee and let it take care of the whole situation.

I ask the chairman of the committee now if he has any objection to that course.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, in reply to what the Senator from Iowa has said, I will state that at the time he spoke to me about this bill I had not given it the consideration that I have subsequently given it. I received a communication from the President in reference to this bill and should have given it earlier consideration, but on account of the press of other business it was impossible for me to do so.

The bill as introduced in the House was sent to me with a request that our committee take it up and consider it at our convenience. The situation as it now develops is that we possibly will be through within two weeks—three weeks at the most—with the hearings on the railroad situation. This matter is of such importance and lies so largely along the line of the work of the Interstate Commerce Committee, in that it proposes to take over the rolling stock, the refrigerator cars, and is so intimately related to the transportation system of this country that, in accordance with the request, I feel it to be my duty to insist that the bill shall remain in the hands of our committee, because before this session is over we will have ample time to give it the consideration to which it is entitled.

Mr. KENYON. May I ask the Senator a question? Do I understand the Senator to say that the President of the United States requests that the bill go to the Committee on Interstate Commerce?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. His communication in reference to the bill was addressed to me as chairman of the Interstate Commerce Committee.

Mr. KENYON. Let me ask the Senator, then, if there is any chance for that committee to hear the representatives of the farming interests of the country who will be here this week?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It may be possible for us to hear them, because we have set aside certain morning hours to have hearings on the railroad bill, and I think perhaps the committee might meet and hear what those representatives have to say, and they might lay before us whatever they desire to present.

Mr. KENYON. If the Senator objects, I am not in a position to urge the matter, because it has more or less elements which should be considered by the Committee on Interstate Commerce, but I felt that it would be impossible for that committee to consider it for another month, and consequently nothing would be done at this session. I rather think that that will be the situation. I withdraw my motion.

NAMING OF THE CITY OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. MYERS. I introduce a bill which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. After it is read I should like to say a very few words about it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator mean read in full?

Mr. MYERS. Read in full. It is short.

The bill (S. 5297) for the naming of the city of Washington, in the District of Columbia, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That that city and community and all thereof situate and now being within the District of Columbia is, and shall be, known and designated as the city of Washington, and the boundaries of the District of Columbia, now and heretofore established by law, are, and shall be, the boundaries thereof; and said city shall be and is the Capital and permanent seat of government of the United States.

SEC. 2. That nothing herein shall repeal, alter, or affect any existing provision of law for the government of the District of Columbia, all of which are continued in full force and effect.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to say just a few words as to my reasons for giving attention at this time to what may appear to some to be a relatively small matter. Those who are authority in law claim that there is no city of Washington; that it has no existence whatever; that the supposed city of Washington is wholly a myth. From time immemorial, at least from the time of the location of the permanent seat of government of the United States in the District of Columbia, all executive documents, all proclamations and messages of the President, have had appended thereto the words, "Done at the city of Washington" on a certain date, until a few months ago, when some one in official life, who claims to be authority on the subject, informed President Wilson, I understand, that there was no city of Washington. Since then the President has been appending to

his official documents the words, "Done in the District of Columbia" on a certain date.

It seems that those of us who are here are simply living or stopping in the District of Columbia. The place in which we do business is the District of Columbia, not the city of Washington or a city of any other name or identity. Massachusetts Avenue, which is near the spot in which we now are, is simply Massachusetts Avenue in the District of Columbia.

Every nation in the world other than the United States, so far as I know, has a capital city, and I think the United States should have a capital city. It does not seem to me very dignified for the District of Columbia, merely encompassing so many square miles in extent, to be the Capital and the seat of government of the United States. Jefferson City is the capital of the State of Missouri, and executive documents there are issued as having been "Done at the city of Jefferson" and not as done in Cole County. The city of Springfield is the capital of Illinois, and executive documents issued there are issued as being "Done at the city of Springfield" and not in Sangamon County. It seems to me that the people of the United States ought to take sufficient pride in their Capital to have it located in a city and for the city to have a name, but it can only be given a name through congressional action. It has none at present. There is a post office here called "Washington," just as a cross-roads country post office named "Smithville" may be located in the midst of a township of prairie country in Minnesota or North Dakota, but the fact that the post office here has a name does not give a name to the city or community around it. The newspapers which are published here bear the name of the city of Washington, while there is no such city. The Washington Post, the Washington Herald, the Washington Times, and the Washington Star are really misnamed. To be properly named, they should be named the District of Columbia Post, the Herald, Times, and Star.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? Does the bill propose to make the limits of the city of Washington coextensive with those of the District of Columbia?

Mr. MYERS. It does.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Will that require city taxation to be imposed upon farms that are within the District of Columbia?

Mr. MYERS. Oh, no; it does not affect taxation or any law whatever in regard to the government of the District of Columbia. The second section of the bill says: "Nothing herein shall repeal, modify, alter, or amend any law regarding the government of the District of Columbia, all of which are continued in full force and effect." The bill is merely a matter of sentiment. It is simply a matter of nomenclature; a bill to give this city a name. Just as Paris is the capital of France, I think our country ought to have a capital located in a city which has a name, not in a nameless city. It is simply a matter of giving a legal name to a place. It was always supposed until a few months ago that the Capital of the United States, the permanent seat of government, was located at the city of Washington, but it is not so. It was simply located in the District of Columbia. It is just as if the city of Jefferson, the capital of Missouri, did not exist; the permanent seat of the government, in that event, would be in Cole County, Mo. This bill would not affect any existing legislation relating to the government of the District of Columbia. It leaves everything of that kind as it is. It gives the city no government, it only gives it a name; that is all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. If the bill relates solely and purely to the naming of the place where the Capital of the United States is to be located I have no objection to it, but it does seem to me that it ought to be looked into closely.

Mr. MYERS. I have asked that it be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for that purpose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It seems to me that if you are going to make the limits of the city of Washington coextensive with those of the District of Columbia you are going to take in vast stretches of territory that are nothing but farm lands and that ought not to be subject to city taxation, and for that reason the bill ought to be examined very closely as to whether or not it will affect the taxation of property in the District of Columbia outside the city limits.

Mr. MYERS. I want it examined closely by the Committee on the Judiciary. It is simply a matter of nomenclature and arises from a sense of pride. There was a good deal of discussion about it in the newspapers of the city some three or four months ago and some expert on law discovered that there was no city of Washington. It rather offended my pride that my country had no capital city, and I have had it in mind since to undertake to give it one and have introduced this bill for that purpose.

Mr. KIRBY. I would like to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MYERS. I shall be glad to answer it.

Mr. KIRBY. I am curious to know what the expert on law considered and how he reached the conclusion that there is no city of Washington?

Mr. MYERS. I do not know what he considered. I only read the newspaper accounts of it. I think, however, he was right. I know of no law creating any city of Washington. There is a law creating the District of Columbia, but there is no law, of which I know, creating the city of Washington; at least, that is what the newspaper reports stated, and I believe it. There is a city popularly known as Washington City. That is the name, the designation given to it by common consent. The city in which Congress sits is called Washington City, but there is, I understand, no authority in law or fact for it. It might as well be called by any other name. I would give it a legal name and status.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment providing that hereafter the Superintendent of the Naval Observatory shall be a retired line officer of the Navy, with rank not below that of rear admiral, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment proposing that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, each fourth-class postmaster in the United States shall be paid a sum not less than 20 per cent of his or her compensation under existing law and not more than 25 per cent thereof as allowance for rent, light, and fuel, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the Post Office appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

Mr. CALDER submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 5261) to legalize informal or defective orders for war supplies and materials, to provide for the cancellation of orders and contracts, for the reimbursement of contractors and manufacturers, for the adjustment of claims or canceled or partially filled contracts and orders, and to provide relief for contractors pending final determination, which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent to take from the calendar for present consideration Senate joint resolution 202, being a joint resolution requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to Congress certain suggestions concerning memorials and monuments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi if he expects the joint resolution to lead to any discussion.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not.

Mr. McCUMBER. I object to anything but morning business at the present time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is objection until the morning business is concluded.

FARM LABOR.

Mr. GORE. I submit a Senate resolution and I ask that it may be read and lie on the table subject to call.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 409), as follows:

Whereas the planting season for the year 1919 is near at hand; and Whereas the loss of four months at this season is equivalent to the loss of the year; and Whereas farm labor is both scarce and dear; and Whereas an abundant harvest is of the greatest concern, not only to producers of this country, but to consumers both at home and abroad: Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the drafted men and volunteers in the military forces of the United States should be mustered out of the service as rapidly as the public interest will permit, and that it is the further sense of the Senate that every effort should be made to muster out at once actual farmers and farm laborers who were engaged in farming at the time of entering the military service and who declare their intention to engage in farming during the current calendar year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

SOLDIERS' ROLL.

Mr. POMERENE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 410), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate are hereby directed to retain in the employ of the Senate those persons who served in the Union Army during the late Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the War with Germany, and whose service in the Senate is necessary and satisfactory, who are not otherwise provided for, and to continue such persons in their positions until cause for their removal shall have been reported to and approved of by the Senate and their removal directed.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS FOR PEACE.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that tomorrow, at the close of the morning business, or as soon thereafter as possible, if I may be permitted, I intend to make some remarks on the proposition of a world league of nations and some questions incident thereto, including the approaching peace conference between the warring nations of the world.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR BRADY.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the 19th of January has been set apart as the day to hear addresses upon the life and services of the late Senator GALLINGER. I desire to give notice that at the same time addresses will be made upon the life and services of the late Senator BRADY.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS.

Mr. McCUMBER obtained the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask my friend, the Senator from North Dakota, before he proceeds, to yield to me just for a moment to renew the request which I made for unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 202. If it leads to any talk or discussion I shall withdraw it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Very well; I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the joint resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 202) requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to Congress certain suggestions, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Commission of Fine Arts be, and they are hereby, requested to report to Joint Committee on the Library for its consideration and submission to Congress suggestions for monuments and other memorials to commemorate the heroes and events of the great war, and the best methods of obtaining artists to execute the same with the view of securing artistic excellence in such memorials.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, even before the peace delegates have assembled the question of a league of nations has assumed a dominant position in the eyes of the world. It has been given more space in the press of this country, Great Britain, and France than any other problem which will come before the peace commission. It is the subject of discourse wherever men assemble. Its supreme importance has been recognized by the introduction in this body of a resolution advising and cautioning our delegates against precipitate or premature action; and its dangers have been expounded by able Senators.

But, Mr. President, notwithstanding this caution, the world looks with hopeful and expectant eyes to this Peace Commission for some international arrangement that will make impossible another such war. We have seen the thunderbolt of war shot from serene skies of peace. We have seen nations basking in the sun of tranquillity suddenly swept by the hurricane of a life and death struggle. We have seen more than four years of the most devastating and sanguinary, the most savage and brutal battles that have ever blackened the earth. And as we reach its close, even the shouts of the victors are drowned by the lamentations of mothers, by the weeping of fatherless children, by the anguished sobs of millions upon millions of poor bereaved mortals. And as we look upon all this devastation and misery, and contemplate the many, many millions of brave boys to whom life was sweet and fair, who have gone down to death to save the world from this bloody monster of military autocracy, their lofty hopes and ambitions entombed with their crushed and mangled bodies, and when we realize that many, many millions of young girls, whom God had created to reign queen of heart and home, must live their lives unwed, robbed of their God-given right of motherhood, and doomed to walk down life's path alone, in a land laid waste by devastation's flaming hand—robbed of the stronger arm of man to support and guide, or the gentle hand of child to caress when the wearied night of age comes on, we may well ask ourselves, Is it impossible for civilization to free itself from the ever-impending dangers of such a scourge? Is it impossible to hold nations to the same moral code in their international relations that each imposes upon its citizens in their personal relations? Must history repeat itself over and over again? Must our children's children suffer and die as their fathers have suffered and died to propitiate the God of War?

Mr. President, the great Teutonic empires answered these questions in the negative. They declared that the nation could

never be held to any code of Christian morals; that the power to conquer carried with it the duty to crush and destroy whenever such action could inure to the benefit of the most powerful.

Against that monstrous doctrine, with all it meant to the future of the world, the unprepared entente powers of Europe, with the final assistance of our own country, fought, and fought to the death, the great military central powers.

Are we now to be told that those nations which so fought and conquered, and the blood of whose sons encarnated the land and the seas for the principle of world justice, are now unable to devise any means to perpetuate those principles? If so, how vain have been our sacrifices, and what a mockery is our pretended civilization!

Mr. President, a suffering and agonized world will never accept the verdict that the god of military prowess, now floored and manacled, shall now be liberated without tether or chain.

I am optimistic enough to believe that great world wars can be prevented, and that the time to present and adopt the restrictive or preventive measures is now and not some indefinite time in the future—is to-day, when the awful horrors and consequences of war are apparent to every heart—and not when those horrors are forgotten and only the military glamor and glory remain to influence the sentiments of humanity.

To-day is the opportune time for the crystallization of the peace sentiment of the world into effective, international compact and guaranty. To-day, at the close of one of the most unprovoked, one of the most inexcusable, and the most bloody wars of all the ages is the auspicious moment for action and final settlement. In Versailles, in view of that battle field where was once a paradise, but now a devastated and desolate hell of ruins, is the place to write and promulgate a new code of international relations and conduct.

Most of those who have expressed themselves on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere against a league of nations predicate their conclusions on the ideas presented by extremists rather than on the views of a far greater though perhaps less voluble number of supporters of a treaty of nations to insure the peace of the world.

In pointing out the dangers of a league of nations they presuppose a league which in effect would constitute a new United States of the world, a confederacy of all the nations of the world, with an international legislature, an international court, an international president, and an international control of the armies and navies of the component powers. They presuppose a confederacy by which each nation surrenders its individual sovereignty to an extent similar to that surrendered by each State entering into the American Union. Were all nations equal or nearly equal in intelligence, in national character, in stability, of temperament, were there no superior and inferior nations and races of the world, no color lines and no race prejudices, the world might be better because of such a league. But we must accept the world situation as it really is. And while we should accord to each nation, notwithstanding its intellectual inferiority, its just and inalienable rights, the right to live and work out its own destiny, we could not assimilate all these inferior races without lowering our own national character and national standard. And therefore, Mr. President, such a league of nations would not only be impracticable but it would, in my humble opinion, be a wrong to the great intellectual nations of the world. Most of the argument of the Senator from Missouri, and some at least of the arguments of other Senators, were based on the hypothesis of such a league of nations. Mr. President, there can not be and there will not be constructed such a league of all nations of the world. With the fall of the premise must fall the deduction.

It may well be asked, then, what kind of a league of nations could with propriety and safety be recognized and adopted by this peace conference?

Mr. President, in replying to this query I shall present the conservative side of the problem. I shall take the world as it actually exists with its real, human, and national propensities, and shall not attempt to write an equal and perfect law for an unequal and imperfect world people. Nor shall I be so presumptuous as to even suggest that a code based upon present world conditions would be applicable a few centuries hence or for all time. There may come a time when because of density of population the law of the survival of the fittest may justify the conquest of sections of the earth held by peoples less fitted to enjoy its domains, just as the Indians of the Western Continent were doomed, that a wiser, a more enlightened and a more noble race might found a higher and a better civilization. It may be that nations now marching in the van of civilization may become so degenerate that they will be but stumbling blocks to the advancing world of intellectuality and progress.

But, Mr. President, so far as we can look into the future, and we can look forward at least a few centuries, we can predicate our action with a reasonable degree of certainty and feel assured that the course of international justice which we shall now prescribe will be applicable to those future conditions.

So let us invoke only those fundamental principles upon which we can all agree; and having thus agreed upon them, let us then pause and question ourselves as to whether it is either wise or necessary to project our international agreements further into the realms of complexities, uncertainties, or interferences.

Mr. President, I shall, therefore, assume in this argument that the edicts, "Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not murder," written by the hand of Deity and imprinted on every human heart, are laws which should govern not only individuals in their relations to each other but are also laws which should govern nations, which are but collections of individuals, in their international relations. I shall, of course, not attempt to convince anyone who will deny the applicability of these rules to nations. All I can say to him is that the German ruling and military caste denied the rule, and the balance of the world affirmed it, and that the victory of the allied cause against the central powers has established by the arbitrament of war the doctrine that nations shall not be exempt in their international relations from the moral code which each enforces upon its own people. That principle being thus settled, there is, therefore, left only the question as to how that moral code shall be established and maintained between nations.

Well, Mr. President, the first thing to do, and the most natural thing to do, is that these nations, each and every one, which have banded together and fought together to establish this moral code as an international rule of conduct, shall agree to and with each other that they will abide by that principle in all their dealings with each other and with every other nation that shall join them in that compact. That they will rob no other nation of its territory or sovereignty; that they will not murder its people for territorial aggrandizement. That is a sufficient beginning, for if all the great nations agree to and do abide by this rule there will be no difficulty in compelling the little nations to conform to it.

The very first clause of the very first article of this agreement should, therefore, declare that each independent nation of the world, as it shall exist at the time this compact shall be executed, has the right to live and work out its own destiny free from any impending danger of any mighty military neighbor.

If you ask why we adopt this particular time as the basis of agreement, I answer: World nations have just been shattered and destroyed by this mighty earthquake, and the broken fragments can not be replaced in their old positions. New nations must and will be created, not only to satisfy the natural aspirations of peoples but also to encircle the nation whose madness precipitated all this slaughter and misery, lest with returning peace there might develop again the old malady; and, further, the impossibility of readjusting the boundaries of Europe to conform to ancient sovereignties. To do that we should be compelled to return France to ancient Gaul, Gaul to Rome, and Rome to the immortal gods.

We should then write into this compact that no nation should make a war of conquest on any other nation; that no nation should forcibly seize or annex any portion of the territory of any other nation or claim or exercise a control or suzerainty over it or in any way limit its complete sovereign rights and independence.

We should provide in that compact for an international court. It matters little whether you call it a court of arbitration or an advisory international commission or The Hague tribunal. Each of the contracting nations should then agree that in case of international disputes it would submit its controversy, whatever that controversy might be, to this court, to the end that the claims of both parties might have fair hearing and publicity not only in both countries but in every other country, and that this court or commission should make its findings of fact and suggest a course of action to bring about a settlement or a reference of the question at issue to arbitration. This compact should then provide that no one of the contracting nations should go to war against another until it had thus submitted its grievances to this court or board; or, still being aggrieved at these findings, that it would withhold any physical force until its grievance and the dereliction of its adversary had been submitted to its cocontractors, the other great nations of the world, and an opportunity given them to use their good offices to secure reparation and justice for any wrong and a final reconciliation.

With such a solemn compact of nations, executed by all the great nations of the world to and with each other, the danger of any great war, any world war, would be pressed far, very far, into the realm of impossibility.

Does anyone believe that had such a great international agreement been in existence prior to 1914, even Germany with her autocratic and irresponsible government would have dared break her compact with each and every one of the other great nations of the world? Does anyone believe that with such a solemn compact with every other nation Austria-Hungary would have defied the world and pounced upon little Serbia and thus have lighted this flame of war?

And, Mr. President, if these nations could not have faced the whole world with such a broken pledge, under their autocratic forms of government, how much less would be the danger under truly representative forms of government which have come into the world to stay?

With such an agreement we should need no great centralized world government, no international army and navy, no international police to enforce an international court's decrees. Both honor and self-interest would unite to compel adherence to this international compact.

There is an ever-growing sense of international honor and integrity in the world, and the very fact that Germany broke her pledged faith with France and Great Britain to respect the territorial and political sovereignty of Belgium, and by that breach sought to crush France at a single blow, has intensified and strengthened this sense of international integrity and created a deeper world sense of abhorrence against international bad faith. And the fact that Great Britain declared that she would uphold her treaty with Belgium, even though there was no bond compelling her to fight on the side of France, though her act thereby put her very life in jeopardy, has given to international obligations a sacredness never before attained in the history of the world.

Mr. President, I want the bond and I want Germany's signature to that bond. She has been the only country that has threatened the peace of the whole world for the last 45 years, and to meet her threat every other nation has had to keep itself armed to the teeth and weighted to the verge of poverty to maintain mighty armaments. No matter how bad or unreliable a man may be, I would rather have his signature evidencing his obligation to me than to be without this written proof and the moral influence that goes with it. When one places his signature to an instrument, he must give good reason why he repudiates it; without his signature he may be under no obligation to explain.

And, so, after the terms of peace have been determined by the victors in this war and the new nations created shall take their places in the world, then I want the joint bond of the central powers to assure international justice. I want the signature of Germany, not only as an evidence that she forever formally repudiates the brutal doctrines of her old rulers and military castes that "Might makes right," but I also want it because I know the industrious, conservative, and frugal German people, rising from the ashes of their calamities, will reconstruct a great nation. And as deeply as I hate Kaiserism and the abominable doctrines of military Germany I believe we should extend the hand of brotherhood and friendship to democratic Germany when its people have repudiated both these stigmas on real German character and have steered their country clear of the worse malady, Bolshevism.

A word now in reference to the stock criticisms against a league of nations.

Mr. President, no matter how much we may legislate, how many resolutions we may introduce and pass, three things are certain: The first, already accomplished, is that acting within his constitutional authority the President has appointed delegates to sit with delegates from other allied nations to agree upon terms of peace; second, that these delegates will proceed to dictate and agree upon such terms of peace; and third, that they will not rise from their deliberations or attach their signatures to any instrument of peace that shall leave untouched or unsettled the question of the prevention of another such war. If they should do so their action would meet the condemnation of the people of all the countries who have endured the horrors and privations of this war. It will not do to say in one breath that war is wrong and in the next breath that such wrong can not be checked.

Now, there seems to be a fear, which I believe to be unfounded, that these delegates will not take up and dispose of these questions in their logical order; that they will take up the question of prevention of future wars before they close this war, or that they will somehow work in the project of a league of all nations before they settle the question immediately involved among the warring nations. To my mind these apprehensions are unwarranted. Remember this peace commission, Mr. President, represents only those countries whose armies have joined to overthrow the central powers. It does not at present include even the delegates from the enemy countries. Therefore, the

very first question that will absorb the attention of the peace commission must necessarily be the terms that will be imposed upon the several enemy countries as conditions of peace. Upon this the only voice that can possibly be heard will be the voice of the victors. A league of world nations can not be consummated until such world nations are subsequently brought into conference. What, then, are the immediate terms which this particular commission will deal with? The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] very tersely and very properly says they are restitution, reparation, and guaranty. But, Mr. President, there could be no guaranty without guarantors, and in this instance it means not only a guaranty on the part of the vanquished to conform to the peace conditions imposed, but on the part of the victors to enforce and maintain every condition that may be necessary to assure the performance of those conditions.

You, therefore, find yourselves engaged in forming a league of the greater nations of the world, the victors and the vanquished, as the most important and immediate factor of this peace treaty, and all there is left for discussion or contention is the general form of this league and the extent to which other powers shall be invited into it.

We are asked by the resolution of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] to advise our delegates not to enter into the discussion of any general league for the prevention of future wars until after they have completed their task of entering into terms of peace conditions. That, Mr. President, it seems to me, they will and must do. But in the speech of the Senator in support of his resolution he suggests that the question of an international alliance for peace might better be considered not only at some future time but by a wholly independent and differently constituted body. With that contention I can not agree. I have already stated in general terms, and shall before I close point out in particular, why I think that course would be a mistake. We all, of course, understand how far-reaching and how complex must be the questions that will arise in the discussion of a general league for peace. But the Senator has pointed out no line of demarcation between what must be disposed of to make the peace treaties effective and enduring and what should be left for further deliberation to which other countries may be invited to participate. On the contrary, both his resolution and his address contemplate that to a certain extent this present peace commission shall provide against the dangers of a recurrence of such a catastrophe as the world has just passed through, the very thing and the only thing a league could accomplish.

The second paragraph of his resolution reads:

That for the safeguarding of those aims the first essential is a definite understanding that the same necessity arising in the future, there shall be the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization.

And in support of this the Senator declares:

It is clear, then, that our attention should now be directed to the enforcement of the remainder of our war aims, now best expressed as restitution, reparation, and guaranties; and to the purpose to complete, to perfect, and to guarantee those aims as we pass to the state of formal peace.

And again:

The definite problem of formally ending the war is: By what measures as to restitution, reparation, and guaranties shall we assume that the war now won shall stay won, that the menace now removed shall stay forever removed? Germane in a broad sense is the question of what measure of safeguarding we may make the recurrence of any similar menace in the future most improbable.

The Senator, therefore, agrees that this present peace commission, not some future commission, must provide for restitution, must provide for reparation, and must provide for guaranties that the menace "now removed shall stay forever removed." Well, Mr. President, if the peace commission does all that, there is nothing left for a league of nations to do, but it can only do that by entering into a league of at least the principal nations of the world. It means, no matter how distasteful the term may be to any Senator, a league of the nations making the guaranty.

And that brings us right up to what shall constitute the limit of this guaranty as fixed by this commission, a limit that no one has pointed out, and, with the thousands of questions which will enter into this peace negotiation, no man on earth can now possibly determine.

The difficulty of predetermining the scope of action of this commission will become more apparent as we investigate some of the main features that will necessarily have to be determined by this peace commission as terms of peace. Let us see what they are. First, there is the question of restitution. What does that mean? We are all agreed that the first thing to be restored are the Provinces of Alsace and Lorraine. Those are Provinces with well-defined borders. Their restitution is

the simplest of all the questions involved. This peace commission may find it necessary in order to assist in securing the future peace of the world to carry this principle of restitution farther along Germany's western boundary, and to return to Belgium all the territory wrested from her in 1839. The allies may deem this necessary to place Germany in a position where the wicked teachings of her military and political rulers which brought on this war can not in the future influence any great section of Europe and thus reendanger its peace and safety. They may extend the borders of Belgium and press Germany back within her old borders east of the Rhine, a boundary which at once becomes not only natural, but would better enable Belgium to defend herself against another attack. I think the average American would agree that those sections of Germany lying west of the Rhine, including Luxemburg, formerly a part of Belgium, might well be apportioned to Belgium to partially compensate her for the awful ravages committed against her territory and people.

I would not depend alone on the league of nations to maintain peace, but to make assurance doubly sure I would close up wherever possible every avenue of danger, just as I would lock up a madman with murderous propensities until he had been unquestionably cured of his dangerous hallucinations.

Nor is that all.

The Senator agrees that there should be a cordon of countries surrounding the Teutonic powers on the east and south that would forever disillusion them of their dream of mitteleuropa, which would dominate first Europe and then the world. In that I think he agrees with the President, for one of the President's fourteen principles of enduring peace provides for the reconstruction of ancient Poland. When the armies of Poland were annihilated, her once vast territory was divided among Russia, Germany, and Austria. Now, one of the duties imposed upon this peace conference will be to reconstruct this Empire from territory of the three great countries which robbed her of her national heritage. This will be another case of restitution.

Again, we have already recognized the Czecho-Slavs as a nation, and the Jugo-Slavs demand from the allies proper recognition. We are morally pledged to destroy the suzerainty of Turkey over European States, and to make independent countries over which she formerly held sway. These will be most perplexing duties, but they must be performed and by this commission. If not so performed, then within 25 years mitteleuropa will be an accomplished fact and the fruits of all our victories blasted.

And again, each time we create a new country we reduce the size, the population, wealth, and ability of our great enemies, Germany and Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey, to compensate for war losses. Serious questions will then arise as to the apportionment of war indemnities among the nations which were in arms against the United States and her allies. You will sever from Germany Alsace and Lorraine, which have furnished many thousands of soldiers in the battles against France. Naturally this portion of new France can pay nothing toward this indemnity. You also take from Austria-Hungary a large portion of its territory, and with Russian territory you constitute new Slav Provinces—a Jugo-Slav country, a Czecho-Slav country, a new Poland. Although portions of these new countries were battling against us, you will find it extremely difficult to say that the part taken from Austria-Hungary shall bear its proportion of taxes to make amends for international transgressions. In the enforced payment of these demands, however apportioned, the nations now banded against Germany must agree to stand united until the last dollar has been paid. And there, Mr. President, we have a league of nations, a treaty for offensive warfare, if necessary, and certainly a treaty which binds them for united offense may very properly bind them into an agreement to maintain a condition which would prevent a military nation like Germany, through intrigue or force, from ever attempting to nullify an agreement for compensation entered into with her or to destroy this cordon of nations, whose viselike grip assists in holding her to her agreement. There are so many, even hundreds, of these collateral questions which will need to be considered that I believe it unwise for this Senate at this time to limit or define the subjects which may or may not be debated and acted upon by our delegates.

I do not consider that we are bound to greatly respect any claim on the part of Russia. Her action in this war has been worse than the action of an enemy. She betrayed her bleeding and suffering allies at a time when her assistance was most needed. She surrendered to German intrigue, and her leaders were bought by German gold. The atrocities committed by the present Bolshevik government of Russia, or rather the usurpers of Russian Government, forfeit for her the respect

and confidence of every nation of the civilized world, and relieve her allies from any debt which might otherwise have been her due.

Our next step, then, Mr. President, is to put these new governments on the map of Europe. That means, first, that we must solve the most delicate and difficult problem of boundaries. Then, having established these nations and fixed their boundaries, are we to dissolve our peace commission and return our soldiers to their homes, leaving the weak and newly created nations to their own fate, with no written understanding or guaranty for their protection? Observing, as we have already observed in the last four years of history, the wonderful diplomatic machinery of the German Government, and remembering her ability to bribe and thereby secure the defeat of gigantic Russia and subject her to her control, how long would these nations, discordant by nature and weak from centuries of bondage, last before they would fall to the wiles and become mere puppets in the hands of the Teutonic powers?

Is it not, therefore, absolutely essential that we insert in the peace agreement that we shall now make with Germany and Austria that no nation shall seek either through diplomacy or through war to destroy the territorial or political sovereignty and independence of any one of these new nations, and not leave that question for Germany and Austria to assent to or not at some future time. Now is the time to bind them, and we can not logically or justly bind them without binding ourselves. If we fail to do that, we shall have left open the gateway for another worse war than that which we have just passed through. This, then, means that these particular nations must enter into a league, if you see fit to call it a league. I prefer to call it a treaty. And they must enter into it now. They must make a treaty now whereby each one binds itself not to do those things which the treaty says shall not be done.

We have, therefore, Mr. President, before we have gotten half way through with our peace agreement, found ourselves in league with Great Britain, France, Italy, Belgium, Roumania, Serbia, and Greece, and such new nations as shall be created. We have agreed that neither one of us shall ever attempt to destroy any one of these nations; that these nations shall live in the world free from the danger of destruction and absorption by some powerful military neighbor; and we must necessarily compel our enemies to join us in those assurances, and that is a league of nations to defend the existence and rights of other nations.

But, Mr. President, to accomplish this we do not need to conform the agreement or treaty to any Utopian dream of a United States of the world. We applaud the action of Great Britain in coming to the defense of France and Belgium to maintain the integrity of her Belgian treaty. Great Britain kept her word; France kept her word; and if we enter into an agreement we will keep our word, and that coalition will hold other nations to their word. We do not need to surrender our several sovereignties in order to maintain an agreement founded upon justice to all nations. It is sufficient that we rest its maintenance upon the honor of the great nations entering into the compact.

The Senator from Pennsylvania admits, nay, he strongly asserts, that under present world conditions we have an interest in Europe; that as in the days of Monroe we foresaw a great danger to us in any European nation extending and developing its power in South America, so to-day we recognize that any single power which could dominate the whole of Europe would be a menace to the welfare of the United States; and the logic of his argument is that we may properly say to European power, you shall not absorb, because of your numbers and military strength, the smaller nations of Europe, and thereby threaten the peace of the world, and with it the peace and safety of the United States. Therefore, Mr. President, we acknowledge our right from a sense of responsibility to ourselves and the world to make this treaty, to establish these new nations, and to guarantee their existence for at least such a time as will enable them to stand on their own feet. There would be nothing in this proposal to prevent smaller nations from uniting for any just economic reason if their people so desired, or greater nations from subdividing if any section became dissatisfied and was able to accomplish its severance.

There has been much said concerning a great standing army that would be required to guarantee the existence of these nations. Mr. President, it would not be necessary to have any great army or a unit of any great army to guarantee it. Once establish these new nations, this cordon of nations surrounding Germany and Austria-Hungary, sustain them until they become really nationalized, supplement that with this world agreement that no nation shall wage a war of conquest against another, and no one country or even several countries will ever dare to

break its contract with all the other nations, including the United States.

But you say Germany broke her treaty relations with Belgium; and why will she not break any other treaty? First, because Germany was not then restrained by a compact with all the nations of the world. Second, because Germany was then the Kaiser, with his military autocracy. The Germany of the future will not be the Germany of the past. Third, she will not dare attempt to break it. But notwithstanding the fact that she has heretofore disdained treaty obligations, there is a sense of obligation not only on the part of the countries entering into these new treaty relations, but the moral sense of every civilized nation is that its government is in honor bound to make good its treaty promises. Its only excuse for not doing so would be when the conditions, through change of circumstances, have made its continuance a danger to the vital interests of the country, and even under such conditions it should only be broken upon due and proper notice.

We now know, whether we knew it at the beginning of the war or not, that the whole purpose of Germany was to add to her territorial domains at the expense of her neighbors—a case of robbery pure and simple. If Germany had known in the beginning that the United States and all the other great powers would enter the war in the defense of Belgium and in the defense of France, she never would have dared to inaugurate a war in violation of such a contract.

Now, I want this peace conference to establish a league of that kind. I do not care whether it goes one step further. I hope it will not attempt to go too far. Such an agreement standing alone, without any provision for armies and navies, would be a league of nations, and it would be league enough to maintain the peace of the world. I certainly should not be satisfied, and I do not believe that in the end the Senator from Pennsylvania would be satisfied, with a mere agreement that, "the same necessity arising in the future, there shall be the same complete accord and cooperation with our chief cobelligerents for the defense of civilization." Such an agreement, in my opinion, is altogether too vague and uncertain as a basis for insuring joint action. Who is to determine whether the necessity is the same? Suppose one or more of the contracting nations thinks it is not the same. What becomes of your accord?

But if all of these nations agree that neither Great Britain, the United States, Germany, nor any other country will make war against any of these nations without first submitting its grievances in the manner I have suggested, then every nation knows exactly what its duty is and what its action should be as against the offending nation.

Leaving aside the difficulty of determining at any moment what may be the hidden purpose of any threatened war against another nation, we would still be left to surmise as to whether the necessities were at all similar. They never, of course, could be exactly the same. On the other hand, if we all agree that the same moral law which governs relations between individuals shall govern the relations of nations to each other, it is then very easy for us to codify a few general principles embodying the fundamental rights of nations. If the principle "Thou shalt not steal" is just as applicable to a collection of a hundred million people constituting a nation as it is to each individual of that nation—if we agree that every civilized nation has a right to enjoy full and complete independence and every right claimed by the most powerful nations, then why can we not embody those declarations in a new international code and agree jointly and severally to abide by them?

Having once declared them, having once declared by a solemn compact of all the signatory nations that we should uphold them, we can safely leave to the nations signing the agreement the question of entering a war against any one nation that should threaten to break the compact. Of course, such an agreement would not make a war absolutely impossible, any more than our civil laws make murder absolutely impossible. But it would make war by any great nation for an unlawful purpose so improbable that it would be almost the equivalent to an impossibility. It is not necessary that we invite Afghanistan or Paraguay. It is not necessary that we invite every quarrelsome little country of Central America or Europe to join in this compact. Their quarrels are but itching spots on the physical world. They are never serious except as lending an excuse for their greedy neighbors to absorb them. And once you declare and agree that they shall not be subject to absorption by any power, you have eliminated the cause of war by eliminating the advantages of war.

But there is another, and to my mind a far greater, reason for enunciating in the peace instrument itself the real obligations of the contracting parties, rather than an agreement that "the same necessity arising in the future, there shall be the

same complete accord and cooperation." First, I do not believe it would be possible to ever again secure the same cooperation, even though similar cause might be imaginable. If we will pause to consider how long this war continued before Italy threw her force with the entente powers, and how much longer before the United States saw fit to enter the contest, even though we knew from the beginning the real purposes of Germany, we can easily comprehend the difficulties of reuniting all of the same powers, even under similar conditions. Without a written compact, are we sure that even our own country would enter a similar war were we not provoked into it as we were provoked into this war?

The defense of our international rights on the seas, the murder of our citizens, were the immediate acts which wrenched us from our old moorings of noninterference in European wars. And while we all agree now and say that we were fighting this war for the safety of civilization we all know very well that we would not have entered the war except for the relentless U-boat campaign of Germany. Had Germany said to this country, We will immediately cease our ruthless submarine warfare; we will sink no merchant ships without first giving such ships an opportunity to surrender and care for the safety of passengers and crew, and had Germany kept her faith in such a promise, we would never have been in this war.

Now, I want to put this Nation in a position in which, should another such a world cause arise, it is bound in honor to uphold these principles, submarine or no submarine, violation of our commerce or no violation. And I want this Government's written bond to that effect, setting its seal and apprising the world of its policy. Mr. President, we are no more justified in asserting that we would go into some future war for the safety of civilization than we would be justified in saying that we would have gone into this war even though there had been no violation of our commercial rights.

I sincerely hope that one effect of this war will be to bring into closer unity the divers populations which make up our American citizenship, and that we shall all become American only in sentiment, free from sympathies for one foreign country and hostility toward another. But up to the beginning of this war that was not true in this country, and it is not wholly true to-day, much as we would wish it to be otherwise, and we must deal with facts as they exist. The success of Germany was not looked upon by the great mass of German-Americans as endangering civilization. A great many, of course, fully comprehended just what Teutonic success would mean to the world, but a far greater number of that race did not fully comprehend it or accept the general world conclusion. Suppose in the near future Italy or Russia should ascend to such military power as would threaten the subjugation of all Europe. The Italian-American or the Russian-American, as the case might be, would most naturally be slow to regard that supremacy as dangerous to the civilization of the world. On the other hand, the Sinn Féin element of our American citizenship would look upon the aggrandizement of any nation which threatened the destruction of Great Britain as a most propitious advance toward a higher world civilization.

Why, Mr. President, we have so many little European nations in this country to-day that presidents of new European republics are elected in New York. I know of no better way to crystallize the divers sentiments of all these divers nationalities into one great dominating American sentiment than a single declaration on the part of America that she stands for the maintenance of the life and liberty and independence of all the civilized nations of the world, hating none and sympathetic with all. Then, and then only, will we be safe in the expectation that we will guide ourselves into a just war without respect to what nations we shall ally ourselves with or what nations we shall make war against.

Mr. President, I find everywhere in the debates on this subject in the Senate the prevailing idea that a league of nations means interference with the internal affairs of each component nation. I do not believe there is any possible danger of any intelligent commission ever inserting such an obligation in a treaty of peace. If they should so forget national sentiment, neither France, Great Britain, nor the United States would ever ratify such a treaty or league of nations compact. With the internal affairs of Russia, after this war is once settled, we shall not interfere. She may divide herself into two nations or into two hundred nations if her people see fit; she may be conservative and peaceful or by her Bolshevik course her people may kill each other. That is their affair. All this league could say is that she shall not attempt to undo the work we have done to assure the peace of the world; that she shall not attempt to crush Poland or the Jugo-Slavs, under whatever name may be given their country. When we declared the Monroe doctrine, which was in effect and to all purposes a league, even though

pronounced only by one nation, the United States guaranteed the territorial and political integrity of every South and Central American State. This country has, however, never claimed or assumed by reason of that doctrine the right to dictate any of the internal affairs of such States, at least without first obtaining the request of the government itself to assist in maintaining order.

Again, it has been argued that if we claim the right to interfere with the internal affairs of the European nations, we must expect to accord to those same nations the right to interfere with the internal affairs of the new world. But, Mr. President, there is nothing in any league proposal I have ever heard of which authorizes such an interference with domestic or internal affairs.

Then, again, is brought to the front the Japanese question of race exclusion. Mr. President, this question can not arise in any league of nations which preserves the sovereign independence of each nation. The question of race exclusion or inclusion is a domestic question only. The right to preserve its racial character, its customs, ideals, institutions, and a form of government that conforms to that character, is the most sacred, as well as the most vital, right of every real nation.

And, Mr. President, if nations would assert that right upon the necessity of maintaining racial purity alone, and not upon the offensive and in many respects unfounded claim of superiority, there could and would be no cause of just complaint against exclusion laws. If Japan afforded such opportunities for exploitation of resources as should invite the immigration into her domains of many millions of the Caucasian race, she would be justified in saying to the Caucasian countries, "We do not question the equality of your people, but if you come in such numbers there must result either assimilation or two distinct races living in one territory. If we assimilate we lose the best of our Nippon character without gaining the best of yours. If we do not assimilate we destroy the solidarity of our nation, the oneness of its ideals, and thereby dim its glory and limit its future achievements and possibilities. We will accord to you all the rights, honor, and respect accorded other great nations, but for these important reasons your people can not marry or live with our people."

So, Mr. President, this country must sacredly preserve the right to say to every other country, not that we are your superiors, but that we must build our national structure on the foundation of Caucasian character and cement it with the purest of Caucasian blood. And on the assertion of such a policy no nation could possibly take offense.

And, Mr. President, even weak nations have the same right to protect their people from stronger or more dominant races of men. I was in Panama a few years ago when its legislature was discussing a proposed exclusion bill. There were a goodly number of negroes in that legislative assembly very active and earnest in support of that exclusion measure. I asked an interpreter to explain whom they proposed to exclude and why. He informed me that the bill excluded Japanese, Chinese, Hindoos, and North Africans; that is, Egyptians, Moroccans, and so forth. It did not exclude the blacks from the jungles of South Africa. These colored representatives were frank and open in expressing their reasons. They said the Japanese and Chinese are very industrious, while our people are not, and in a few years their industry would manifest itself in accumulations. They said that the Hindoos were very frugal and lived much more economically than the natives and that the North African people were sharp traders and peddlers; and so they proposed to protect themselves against peoples who were more industrious, more frugal, and superior traders or merchants. Satisfied with their mode of life and desiring to avoid becoming a mere subservient people, they had a perfect right to protect themselves in this way against peoples whose superiority in these special respects threatened their destruction.

This, however, is a little outside the general argument, but I mention it to show that the right of exclusion, being a purely domestic right, can not and will not be endangered by such a treaty as I have suggested to maintain the peace of the world.

Again, it is claimed that our Monroe doctrine will be endangered. So far from endangering that doctrine we would strengthen it. To-day that doctrine rests entirely on the policy and on the power of the United States to maintain the territorial and political integrity of each one of these American States as against any European power. The league of nations which adopts as its guiding principle the independence of every nation of the world, which guarantees its territorial and political life and integrity, certainly can not be said to endanger our Monroe doctrine, which guarantees the independence of the nations of the western world only.

Again, this league of nations is attacked on the ground that it is an entangling alliance with European powers; that the traditional policy of this Nation, advised by Washington and

strengthened by precedent, has been to avoid entangling ourselves in European quarrels. It is true, Mr. President, that the Father of his Country advised against entangling alliances with any foreign nations. But is an agreement with all nations on some practical scheme to maintain and enforce peace and justice an alliance in the sense used by Washington? It is no more an alliance, Mr. President, than any treaty made with any nation or set of nations to follow a definite course. When we entered into a treaty with Great Britain in 1850 to the effect that any canal cut across the Isthmus of Panama should be free to the vessels of all nations of the world on equal terms, both these nations were bound in honor to maintain that principle against any nation that would attempt to disregard it. Was that an entangling alliance with an European power?

Again, very shortly after the inauguration of this Government, while the Farewell Address of our first President was still ringing in the ears of his countrymen, we declared the Monroe doctrine, by which we guaranteed the territorial integrity of every nation of the Western Hemisphere against the conquest of any nation of the world. We never regarded this as an entangling alliance. And yet to-day Belgium and France are next-door neighbors compared with Argentina and other South American States, while our trade relations with Europe are ten times greater than those with South America.

Again, but a few years ago we entered into an agreement with Great Britain, Japan, and Russia to conserve and protect the lives of the seals of the Pribilof Islands, to protect them not only against the citizens of the contracting parties, but against the citizens of any other country. Is it possible that we can without a breath of criticism enter into a treaty with these nations of Europe and Asia to protect the lives of a few thousand seals and yet we shall not be permitted to enter into treaty relations with all the great nations of the world to save the lives of millions upon millions of our fellow beings?

Mr. President, we have reached a position in commerce and civilization where every nation has a vital interest in the peace and welfare of every other nation of the world, an interest of far greater moment than Alaskan seal, Newfoundland fisheries, or even isthmian canals.

If you still insist that this would be an alliance, let me ask you a most direct and pertinent question: Do you believe that the United States, as well as the world, is far better off to-day than either would have been had the central powers been victorious in this war? I know your answer will be yes. I do not attempt to argue with those who would answer no, because they so fail to grasp the seriousness of the issue that argument would be futile. Then you are glad that we went into this war and entered into this alliance because of the big thing that was at stake—the safety of civilization and the happiness of the world—and not because of the comparatively little thing—the violation of our commercial rights.

Then, Mr. President, if you justify our alliance with France, Great Britain, and Italy in this war to protect the safety and civilization of the world, then how in Heaven's name can you condemn an alliance with the same and other countries to prevent another assault upon the safety and civilization of the world? How can you in one breath approve the alliance to make war to save the world and in the next breath condemn an alliance to save the world by the prevention of any savage and brutal war which might threaten it?

Mr. President, epitomizing into terms of definite declaration a practical agreement to assure world peace and justice, this peace commission should agree upon a new international code or constitution declaring these fundamental principles:

First. That each and every independent nation of the world has a right to live, and in perfect security enjoy its territorial and political sovereignty, and to work out its own national destiny free from any impending danger from any more powerful neighbor.

Second. That no nation entering into this compact shall make war of conquest against any other nation.

Third. That no such nation shall forcibly annex any portion of the territory of any other nation, or claim or exercise a control or suzerainty over it, or in any way limit its sovereign rights or independence.

Fourth. That there shall be maintained an international court of arbitration or conciliation.

Fifth. That each nation joining in this compact shall, in case of international dispute between any of them, submit its controversy to this court to the end that the claims of both parties may have fair hearing and publicity not only in each of the contending countries but in every other country entering into this compact.

Sixth. That this court shall make and publish in all the countries joining in this compact its finding of fact and its

suggestions of the acts to be done or course to be pursued to bring about an amicable settlement of the controversy.

Seventh. That if either country is dissatisfied with the findings and suggestions of this court, it shall nevertheless withhold the use of any physical force until its grievance and the claimed dereliction of its adversary have been submitted to the other contracting nations and an opportunity given them to exercise their good offices to secure a reconciliation—offices which each nation shall pledge itself to exercise.

Mr. President, to deny the efficacy of such an international pledge is to assert that there is no such thing as national honor or national sense of justice in the world. The repudiation of that false assertion has been written in the blood of millions of the bravest and truest sons of the bravest and truest nations on the face of the earth.

With such an instrument written upon the sacred altar of eternal right, dedicated to humanity and pledging the sacred honor of every mighty power, we may with justifiable reliance begin the reconstruction of a new world forever freed from the phantom of fear or the ominous clouds of a destructive war.

PURCHASE OF LOWER CALIFORNIA.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, on the 2d instant I introduced a Senate resolution, which I send to the desk and ask that the Secretary read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLIS in the chair). The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to open negotiations with the Republic of Mexico for the purchase of the peninsula of Lower California and for the purchase of that tract of land in the State of Sonora, Republic of Mexico, approximating in area 10,000 square miles, and lying north of the parallel of 31° 20' N.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, my first duty is to assure the Senate that this resolution is not without precedent, for I assume that upon such a serious and vital matter the Senate would not without precedent adopt such resolution. During the present session there has taken place in the Senate a most illuminating debate in which many Senators have participated, and it has been clearly pointed out that upon a number of occasions the United States Senate has passed resolutions requesting the President of the United States to negotiate treaties of various kinds. It will be recalled that on the 3d of March, 1835, the Senate passed a resolution which I now send to the desk and ask that the Secretary read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The following motion, submitted by Mr. Clayton, was considered and agreed to on March 3, 1835:

Resolved, That the President of the United States be respectfully requested to consider the expediency of opening negotiations with the Governments of other nations, and particularly with the Governments of Central America and New Grenada, for the purpose of effectually protecting, by suitable treaty stipulations with them, such individuals or companies as may undertake to open a communication between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans by the construction of a ship canal across the isthmus which connects North and South America, and of securing forever, by such stipulations, the free and equal right of navigating such canal to all such nations on the payment of such reasonable tolls as may be established to compensate the capitalists who may engage in such undertaking and complete the work.

Ordered, That the Secretary lay this resolution before the President of the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, that resolution was adopted by the Senate during the administration of President Jackson. I now send to the desk a copy of a resolution which was agreed to by the Senate on March 1, 1888, during the administration of President Cleveland. I ask that the resolution be read by the Secretary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate of the United States, That, in view of the difficulties and embarrassments that have attended the regulation of the immigration of Chinese laborers to the United States under the limitations of our treaties with China, the President of the United States be requested to negotiate a treaty with the Emperor of China containing a provision that no Chinese laborer shall enter the United States.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, history informs us that of all the Presidents who were jealous of the Executive power and authority, Presidents Jackson and Cleveland were the most. In view of the fact that the Senate did not hesitate to adopt these resolutions, during the administrations of those two Presidents, calling upon the Executive to conclude treaties, I feel that this resolution is fully justified by precedent; but if not justified by precedent it is justified by the Constitution, for the Constitution confers upon the Senate and lays upon the Senate the right and duty not only to reject treaties, to amend treaties, and to change them, but undoubtedly also the inherent right to

suggest—respectfully, of course—to the Chief Executive what sort, nature, or kind of a treaty the Senate would be pleased to consider.

The peninsula of Lower California is a tongue of land which extends downwardly from the United States. It is nearly 800 miles in length, its greatest width is 150 miles, while its narrowest width is about 40 miles.

Numerous small islands and jutting rocks embroider both its Gulf coast and its Pacific coast. It is the vermiform appendix to Mexico, and by reason of its inaccessible interior, sparse settlements, and the numerous hiding places on its Pacific coast, which may upon uncomfortable occasion become points of infection and danger, it is to Mexico an appendage of doubtful value or utility.

Lower California is so isolated from the Mexican mainland and is so slimly attached to and so inaccessible to Mexico that the Mexican Government has had but little and within the past decade has had substantially no authority or jurisdiction over the peninsula. The Mexican Republic has little or no interest in the peninsula and makes no appropriations to sustain or govern the same. The Republic derives but little, indeed no revenue from this domain, which is to Mexico terra incognita. The neglect and abandonment of the peninsula by Mexico is caused by the fact that although within our own yard, the peninsula is a land of mystery, and there is a remarkable paucity of data concerning this romantic stretch of land. Its isolation from Mexico is more real and complete than the American people generally believe. To reach the peninsula from the mainland the Mexican authorities must either cross the Gulf of California, which has an average width of 200 miles, and Mexico has no ships on the Pacific side or in the Gulf, except a few fishing boats, or the Mexican expedition must journey northwesterly through the State of Sonora on the mainland and toward the mouth of the Colorado River, a distance of many hundreds of miles traversing a real desert—a desert where the raw and scorching sun comes down as a pitiless flail; where the white sand reflects the heat and glare and blinds the traveler; where no dew nor moisture is deposited during the night, and where a wind, hot as a furnace blast, usually blows from the south; where there are no roads, no trails, and no water. I am speaking of the northwestern part of the State of Sonora and not of the peninsula.

A journey over this stretch of country is dangerous and is fraught with extreme discomfort. Day after day the eye rests upon the same illimitable expanse of hot sand, with now and then a cactus lifting its arms and thorns into the brazen gloom. The loneliness and helplessness of the traveler there seem to sever him from human things and to remove him an infinite distance from the world with its interests and its occupations.

Mexico is not equipped either in wealth or progressive ideals or enterprise to penetrate and reclaim this vast and forbidding tract of country—northwestern Sonora—some of which [indicating Sonora on the map] has not been moistened by rainfall for scores of years. So we perceive that Lower California is really isolated from the Mexican Republic.

The peninsula, I repeat, is a vermiform appendix to Mexico. It is the heel—the Achilles heel—to the United States.

The Mexican Republic is both unwilling and unable to police the domain, and is unable to resist aggressions from or settlements on the peninsula by oriental powers, hence a base of supplies or of military and naval operations with comparative ease and secrecy could be established among the numerous islands on its Pacific coast.

The enforcement of law and order on the peninsula is left wholly to the governor who represented the Diaz régime, and who was and still is independent of both Gen. Carranza and Villa. The governor's moderation and prudence have given, at least, a tolerable existence to the people in Lower California. The forces at the command of the governor could present but short and feeble resistance to any effort on the part of a hostile force from the Orient, and the governor could expect and could receive no aid from the Government on the Mexican mainland.

But American industry, American money, and the American pioneer would soon turn the Colorado River upon these blistering sands; and lo! the orange tree would soon give forth its golden fruit; the lemon, the fig, and the date would flourish; and the long-staple cotton would soon spread a snow-white banner over what was once a furnace that desiccated all life, both animal and vegetable, for the American pioneer, who, although he has been silent in his wondrous achievements, has with indomitable courage transformed into smiling fields and farms every desert he has encountered.

Referring now to the Senate resolution which I have introduced, it will be observed that the Chief Executive is called

upon to negotiate a treaty with Mexico for the purchase of this peninsula [indicating on a map] and for that strip of land [indicating] lying north of parallel 31° and 20', which means that the southern boundary line of the State of Arizona would become, if the purchase were negotiated, a horizontal line from the one hundred and eleventh meridian of longitude west from Greenwich to the Gulf coast, so that the southern Arizona boundary line would be a straight line, and would proceed along the parallel of 31° and 20' north latitude, whereas it now deflects at the one hundred and eleventh meridian and runs to the northwest to the Colorado River.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Senator's resolution is for the purchase by this Government of Lower California?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. WATSON. Is there a responsible Government in Mexico which has the right to make such a sale?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, we have an ambassador in Mexico, and that Government has an ambassador here; and in international law, as the Senator from Indiana well knows, when two countries have thus received ambassadors and their credentials have been passed upon and accepted we have a right to assume, at least, that a government which can receive money is in existence. It would be a very poor and feeble government that was so feeble and so poor that it could not receive money.

Mr. WATSON. Especially Mexico.

Mr. ASHURST. Quite so.

Mr. WATSON. But while what the Senator from Arizona states is theoretically correct, the practical question is, Does the Carranza Government control Mexico at this time? Is it not a fact that that portion of Mexico is in the hands of two or three others who are at this time in a state of rebellion against it?

Mr. ASHURST. I am sure the Senator from Indiana has been out of the Chamber temporarily, because I have covered that point, but I will repeat what I have already said. For more than 10 years the Mexican Government has practically abandoned Lower California. The Federal or so-called de facto Government of Mexico receives no revenue whatever from the peninsula; it makes no appropriations whatever to govern it; it sends no ships, no troops, no soldiers, no supplies to that territory, and it receives no troops, no soldiers, and no supplies from the peninsula. The present governor of the peninsula was appointed during the Diaz régime, and his moderation and prudence have given a tolerable existence to the people there. I think that statement answers the Senator's question.

Mr. WATSON. Unfortunately, we have not very accurate information about the status of affairs in Mexico, but I have understood—

Mr. ASHURST. I am going to deal with that at a later period, if the Senator will withhold his question.

Mr. WATSON. At a later period in this speech?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; at a later period in this speech.

Mr. WATSON. Very well.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Iowa, of course.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will it require an amendment of the constitution of the Republic of Mexico to bring about a sale of that portion of its territory to the United States?

Mr. ASHURST. For many years I was under the misapprehension or at least I believed that an amendment to the Mexican constitution would be necessary in order to enable Mexico to sell a portion of her land, but I have read within recent months the Mexican constitution. That instrument does not require an amendment to the constitution under such circumstances, but, inasmuch as the constitution is amendable by the Mexican Congress, it would not be a serious thing to amend the Mexican constitution.

Mr. CUMMINS. But the sale of their territory would require an amendment to their constitution?

Mr. ASHURST. No; because the constitution that I read was silent on that point.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will my colleague permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I have looked with some care within the last week into the constitution of Mexico of 1857 and the various amendments to that constitution up to this hour. I had been under the impression that there was a provision in the constitution that particularly inhibited the disposition of

any Mexican territory, under very severe penalties and pains to him who proposed or accepted such disposition. I find in the last constitution, adopted within one or two years, that there is a provision giving the power to the Congress of the Republic to pass laws and to affix such penalties as they please in the interest of the States of the Republic of Mexico. I think that the misapprehension as to their power to dispose of their lands rests probably on some statute that may have been passed under that provision of the constitution, and I doubt not that we have been laboring under a misapprehension for many years about the limitation on the right of the Republic to dispose of its land. I can find nothing in the constitution either of 1857 or the one lately adopted to justify that impression.

Mr. CUMMINS. That means, then, from the Senator's standpoint, that if the Congress of the Republic of Mexico should authorize the sale of this portion of their territory the transfer would be a valid one.

Mr. ASHURST. That is my view of the situation. It is possible, therefore, that the Mexican Government would consider the sale of Lower California to the United States in exchange for the moneys so urgently needed by it for the rehabilitation of Mexico.

The United States would be well advised did it add to its long list of fortunate purchases this easily-to-be-made-fertile pendant of contiguous territory, and thus foreclose possible untoward eventualities.

Our diplomatic duties of the moment demand of us the most skillful employment of the opportunities which lie open to our hand, in order that we may insure ourselves and our neighbors an enduring peace.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield to me further, if it is not an undue interruption?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. Is it not a fact that this matter was once proposed to Carranza and was by him rejected?

Mr. ASHURST. As to that I do not know. It may have been, but the chances are that the terms were not satisfactory.

Mr. CUMMINS. But who proposed it? Who had the authority to propose anything of that kind?

Mr. WATSON. I do not think it was proposed by anybody in authority; but my understanding is that Carranza was approached for the purpose of ascertaining whether he would be willing to dispose of Lower California, and he made the statement that it was utterly impossible to do so and could not be thought of.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, before I proceed to a description of the climate, the resources, the bays, and gulfs of the peninsula I wish to say generally that the United States would be well advised did it add this to its long list of fortunate Territorial purchases. It is to us easy to be made a fertile land, and every honorable attempt should be made to foreclose untoward possibilities and eventualities with respect to oriental populations that may settle and colonize Lower California.

Mr. President, American statesmen for at least three-quarters of a century have had this in mind; but one untoward event after another, one superimposed on the other, has prevented consideration of the question.

On the 5th of August, 1863, Gen. Edward Fitzgerald Beale, a very remarkable man, a great sailor on the sea and with "ships of the desert," a diplomat, and explorer, wrote a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, Salmon P. Chase, respecting the subject, as follows:

I am quite sure I have not exaggerated the great value to our country of that long mountain ridge which abounds in good harbors on both the Gulf coast and the Pacific and is filled with mineral wealth of every description. I beg you will give this subject a few hours' consideration. Valuable and abundantly occupied as your time is, I assure you this matter is worthy of your attention. I desire most particularly to call your attention to the fact that we have it in our power at this time by purchase of Lower California and a very small portion of the opposite coast—

He referred to the part of Sonora to which I have referred—to possess the mouth of the Colorado, destined to be as important to us on the Pacific as is the Mississippi to the Eastern States. If the line of the Gadsden Purchase be straightened, instead of being deflected at 111 degrees of longitude, and touched the Gulf at the coast, and we should possess ourselves of Lower California, we should then control entirely the navigation of the Colorado, which the future will prove of the utmost importance to the welfare of the Pacific Coast States.

President Lincoln directed Secretary of the Treasury Chase to say to Gen. Beale that Secretary Seward would give attention to this important subject at the earliest opportunity.

The distance from Yuma to the mouth of the Colorado River as measured along the main river channel is about 105 miles. The Colorado River below Yuma changes its channel so often that its present position is quite uncertain. The distance given should therefore be considered as approximate only.

The New International Encyclopedia gives for the area of the territory of Lower California 58,328 square miles. Let me say parenthetically that I am sure from the investigations I have made for the past six years that the area is much larger than that. Its population in 1900 was about 22,572, La Paz, in the southern district, having a population of 5,536, and Ensenada, in the northern district, a population of 2,170.

Mining has undoubtedly been the principal industry of Lower California, as it has yielded some rich returns. The silver mines near La Paz are said to have been worked as early as 1700. The Boleo district at Santa Rosalia, on the east coast, is a copper camp worked by a French company (Compagnie du Boleo), and was in 1917-18 the third largest producer of copper in Mexico. Santa Rosalia is reported to have a population of 9,500. There is a large undeveloped deposit of iron ore at San Vicente, near San Quentin, on the west coast. A small shipment of manganese was made from a deposit at Mulege, on the west coast south of Santa Rosalia. Some magnesite is shipped from the west coast.

Cattle and horses are raised in the valleys, where there is water, and the southern part, which receives more rainfall and consequently is more tropical in character, has more agricultural lands than the rest. Most of the country is very arid, with practically no running water and few permanent springs. The climate in the northern and central parts is equable and healthful, resembling that of the coast region of southern California, though slightly warmer and somewhat drier than California. The country is the axis of a mountain system with peaks of 10,000 feet and elevated plateaus.

I have here some copious data which I have secured from responsible authorities within the past two days. That data I have just stated were supplied by the Geological Survey.

LOWER CALIFORNIA.

Mr. President, the Territory of Lower California is divided into two parts, the southern district, extending from the twenty-eighth parallel to the southern end of the peninsula, and the northern district, lying between the American border and the twenty-eighth parallel. The twenty-eighth parallel divides the peninsula into two practically equal sections. The two districts are extremely different in almost every particular. The northern district bears strong resemblance to the southern part of the State of California as it was 50 years ago before the days of large irrigation projects and intensive cultivation. It has practically the same climate, the same large areas of tillable land only awaiting irrigation, timberlands in the mountains, large grazing tracts, and the same mineralogy. Toward the lower end of the district, however, the mountains become more rugged, streams disappear, the mesas and rolling lands become deserts covered with many and wonderful varieties of cacti, and human habitations are found only in the few small valleys having a constant water supply from the Sierras.

So commences the southern district, and in general the character of all that district is the same, although the mountains become smaller and its monotonous aridity is relieved by a few beautiful, fertile valleys which are veritable garden spots. These valleys or cultivated areas are the places where are found the old missions established by the Jesuit fathers in the eighteenth century and continued by the Dominicans in the early part of the nineteenth century. Indeed, it is a corollary that wherever an old mission is located water will be found hard by. The principal cultivated areas of the southern district are La Paz, the capital, San Jose del Cabo, at the extreme southern end of the peninsula, and the valleys of Hulege, Comondú, Purisima, and San Ignacio. These localities are much more thickly settled and more intensively cultivated than the developed areas of the northern district, and the southern district, as a whole, has approximately three times the population of the northern.

POPULATION OF LOWER CALIFORNIA—INDUSTRIES—PRESENT CONDITION.

There are no actual figures as to the present population of the peninsula, but from all available data it can not be more than 25,000—7,500 for the northern district and 17,500 for the southern. The only vital statistics available show 80 births and 132 deaths in the northern district during the past year. This, taken with the fact that many people have left Lower California on account of the revolution, shows conclusively that the total population is decreasing.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, of what is that population made up?

Mr. ASHURST. I have not that data here, but I can inform the Senator that it is nearly all made up of Mexicans, with some aborigines, and probably 6 to 7 per cent Americans.

In the south the principal industries are mining, pearl fishing, and the cultivation of tropical fruits; in the north the cultivation

of wheat, cattle ranching, and mining are the most important activities.

AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS—WHEAT, COTTON, FRUITS.

Wheat is the principal agricultural crop grown in the northern district. It is cultivated in the valleys and on the mesas of the Pacific littoral, between latitude 31° and the American border, and in the Mexican portion of the Imperial Valley. The yield of wheat on the Pacific littoral for 1914 is shown by the following figures: Receipts by local flour mill, 47,508 bushels; exported to United States, 2,958 bushels; seed, about 6,000 bushels; on hand, about 8,000 bushels; total yield, 64,466 bushels. The wheat in the Imperial Valley was grown with barley and the yield was about 88,000 bushels (mixed), all of a very poor quality.

Practically all the flour that is used for the people there is shipped in. Sometimes, in their aboriginal way, they grind wheat, but there is hardly a flour mill in the peninsula—at least there was not two years ago.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. How many bushels of wheat did the Senator say were raised there?

Mr. ASHURST. The figures I have indicate 88,000 bushels in the Imperial Valley.

Other agricultural products of the northern district are hay and beans, but no large yield of either is obtained.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Are there any railroads there?

Mr. ASHURST. There are practically no railroads. There is a line a few miles south of the boundary line between Lower California and upper California. There is a small line there that runs for a few miles into the peninsula.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That is nothing but the short line going down to a little place called Tia Juana.

Mr. ASHURST. In the Imperial Valley—the Imperial Valley lies partly in the peninsula—cotton has become very important in the last three years. In 1914 between 30,000 and 35,000 acres were planted in that section and a yield of between 25,000 and 30,000 bales of 500 pounds each obtained, with seed estimated at 1,000 pounds per bale. The cotton was picked by Chinese labor, at 75 cents gold per 100 pounds for the first and 85 cents for the second picking. It is expected that about the same acreage will be put in this year, though the failure of the cotton market has been disastrous to some of the growers.

Grain crops are not grown in the southern district of the peninsula. The agriculture of that section consists of tropical and semitropical fruits and cane. The fruits grown are grapes, figs, Arabian dates, oranges, lemons, limes, tangerines, olives, and pomegranates. Small quantities of these fruits, especially dates, are exported to the west coast of Mexico, but the greater part is consumed in the district. So far as can be learned, the yield for last year was normal, but there are no figures available as to the quantities grown.

LIVE STOCK IN NORTHERN HALF OF PENINSULA.

Cattle are raised in both the northern and southern districts of Lower California, but the industry is more important in the northern half. Here are large grazing tracts in the hills, and several American cattlemen have established profitable ranches. At times there have been between 40,000 and 50,000 head of cattle in the district, but the end of 1914 saw not more than 12,000 left, for, on account of the revolution and the prohibitive export tax imposed on cattle, the ranchers hastened to drive all the stock they could to the United States. At present this industry is as dormant as others in Lower California.

MINING THE MOST IMPORTANT INDUSTRY IN NORMAL TIMES.

In normal times the most important industry of Lower California is mining, gold, silver, and copper existing in the mountains throughout the peninsula.

FISHERIES—RESOURCES NOT ADEQUATELY EXPLOITED.

One of the most valuable resources of Lower California is the unending food supply in the coastal waters, but this is unexploited as far as the local population is concerned. At Magdalena Bay there is a turtle-meat and oyster cannery operated by Japanese, whose product, when the industry is developed, is destined for American and Japanese markets; and a Mexican concession for fishing along the west coast has been operated during 1914 by an American company in San Diego under a lease. The fish and lobsters—really crawfish—obtained by this company have all gone to western United States markets. Besides these two industries no attempt has been made to exploit the waters along this coast, although they abound in fish of all kinds.

UNDEVELOPED RESOURCES OF LOWER CALIFORNIA.

The peninsula of Lower California has always been to the average American an unknown land. To the popular imagination it is a barren country noted chiefly for its deserts and

cactus growths. In a sense this is true as applied to the central southern section, but the northern district is a world apart and has resources which, if lying in the United States, would be worth millions. The world knows about the orange and lemon groves of California, but few realize that immediately to the south of that garden spot lies a country just as fertile, but out of the frost belt, with thousands of barren acres only waiting water to grow in abundance almost any known crop.

OPPORTUNITY AND NECESSITY FOR IRRIGATION—PROJECT BY BRITISH CAPITALISTS.

The problem of Lower California is to bring the water to the land. In the valleys and on the mesas between the mountains and the Pacific Ocean there are 450,000 acres of potentially rich and uncultivated land. Scattered about this same section are 15,000 acres of cultivated land, only 500 acres of which are irrigated. These 500 acres are on a ranch near Ensenada, and the irrigated area is devoted to Lima beans, with an excellent annual yield.

Most of the best irrigable land referred to lies to the east and to the northeast of San Quentin. A project involving the expenditure of millions by British capitalists was being considered as late as 1913, but the unsettled conditions in Mexico have prevented any action being taken. This project contemplated a dam across the Santo Domingo River, on the western slope of the San Pedro Martir Range, and it is believed to have been a perfectly feasible undertaking. There are other opportunities for the conservation and distribution of water in the district, and it is on the future materialization of these that the hope of all agricultural development lies. It should be remembered that while the average rainfall along the coast is between 9 and 10 inches, the fall in the mountains is between 20 and 30 inches, not to mention the winter snows that cover the higher mountains. Yet nearly all of this water is lost, either flooding the rivers in the rainy season and running out to sea or sinking into the ground and disappearing before it gets down to the arable land.

MINING NOT PROPERLY DEVELOPED—TIMBER THAT IS STILL UNTOUCHED.

In mining, the resources of the district have been barely scratched. Alamo, a great mining camp of the early nineties, is deserted and yet it was never really developed. Several millions of dollars were taken out of Alamo and still the shafts did not go below the 350-foot level, and the mother lode—which all mining men knowing the place agree must exist—was never found. The San Fernando copper deposits have never been exhausted. There is copper there to-day in quantities to pay well for its exploitation. Besides these there are many places where gold, silver, copper, iron, sulphur, and semiprecious stones have been found in paying quantities, and there are to-day many embryo mines that some day must and will be developed. In addition to that, Mr. President, the timber resources in the high mountain ranges are very considerable.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Can the Senator tell us the character of the timber?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes. There is pine timber on the slopes of San Pedro Martir and on the mountains north of Alamo that must some day be taken to market. The following statement is an excerpt from a report made by Col. D. K. Allen in 1887 to the old International Co.—owning large land concessions—on the timber region of San Pedro Martir:

Large trees per acre, 25; small trees per acre, 10; average number of logs per tree, 3; average diameter of each, 2 feet 9 inches; length of logs, 12 feet.

Number of Norway pine per acre, 17; number of white pine per acre, 4; number of fir trees per acre, 3; number of red cedar per acre, 1; total, 25.

Number of dead trees per acre, 3; number of trees down per acre, 2. Total number of Norway pine trees, 8,500,000; total number of white pine trees, 2,000,000; total number of fir trees, 1,500,000; total number of red cedar trees, 500,000; total number of trees on San Pedro, 12,500,000.

Total number of logs on San Pedro, 37,500,000; total number of feet of lumber, 18,750,000,000; total cords of wood (4 feet), 200,000,000; total number of small trees, 5,000,000.

Average fall of snow, 4 to 8 feet; average time it lies on ground, 4 to 20 weeks.

That is, of course, in the mountains in the southern part of the peninsula. The average rainfall in the summer is 20 to 30 inches. While I am speaking of rainfall, let me say that in the part of Sonora embraced within my resolution there is probably less rainfall than in any other part of North America. In the part of Sonora which I have indicated here—the northwestern part—the rainfall is about 2 inches per year, and, in fact, there are vast tracts where rain has not fallen for scores of years.

Adverting to the head of the Gulf of California at Puerto Isabel, which is two and a half miles above the mouth of the Santa Clara, there is a good landing place. About 2 miles above this point is a place called Shipyard. It is not shown on any map. There are a few frame buildings there. The Santa Clara

River is in the vicinity of the mouth of the Colorado, and is at the northern part of the Gulf of California. South of Puerto Isabel there is a good landing place at Puerto Resugio, where there are two fine harbors, with good anchorage, sheltered from all winds. Those harbors would both be within the United States should the Chief Executive conclude a treaty with Mexico for the purchase of this tract of land, about 10,000 square miles in area, lying to the southwest of Arizona.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator? Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PHELAN. Do I understand that the Senator by resolution seeks to begin negotiations with Mexico for the acquisition by purchase, and with the approval of the residents, of that district?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, Mr. President. My resolution is a very simple one. It is a Senate resolution calling upon the President "to open negotiations with the Republic of Mexico for the purchase of the peninsula of Lower California, and for the purchase of that tract of land" in the northwestern part of Sonora, Mexico. Yes, Mr. President; the resolution simply, solely, and only calls upon the President to bring into requisition the literary and diplomatic resources of the State Department and peaceably and honorably to purchase from Mexico this vast tract of land. There is no thought of aggression, no suggestion of seizure or the grabbing of land, but the purchase of land just as the United States has for a century or more honorably purchased lands as it felt it needed them, and as other countries felt they wished to dispose of them.

Mr. PHELAN. Do I understand, then, that it would be purely voluntary on the part of Mexico, and that the territory is of no value to Mexico?

Mr. ASHURST. The territory, by reason of a series of circumstances, which I will set out later, is of no value to Mexico. Mexico has not our enterprise. It is sluggish, and the tract of land there is of no value to Mexico. If it remains in Mexican possession, it will be the same 100 years from to-day as it is to-day, a dreary, barren waste; whereas American money, American spirit, American enterprise, can make it into gardens and farms, and a blessing to civilization.

Mr. PHELAN. I do not know that the Senator intends to bring out the strategic value of Lower California. I have in mind the fact that when California was acquired from Mexico, several foreign powers—notably Great Britain and France—had plotted to acquire the territory, which would have cut us off in our continental expansion from the Pacific. The policy of the United States then was not to take the territory, although she had the power to take it, but to prevent any other power from taking it. After the declaration of war with Mexico there was, indeed, a contest between the United States and Great Britain, resulting in a race between the American ship *Savannah* and the British ship *Collingwood*, to see which should first reach the capital of California, at Monterey, to raise the flag; so by a mere accident we are in possession of that territory. The United States could not suffer foreign powers to occupy the Pacific coast. I recall, and I wish simply to direct the attention of the Senator to the fact, that not long ago the Japanese, by negotiation—because there has been a great deal of intrigue between the island Empire and the Mexicans—were endeavoring to get a foothold in Lower California, and it was only stopped by the Lodge resolution, passed by this body, declaring that this Government would regard the colonization by any foreign Government directly or indirectly by its citizens as an unfriendly act to the United States. Now, there is always the danger of colonization by other nations and of acquisition by secret treaties or otherwise, inspired by Zimmermann letters or otherwise. Hence, it is a matter of great strategic importance; but I would not think, unless by the free act of Mexico, that the United States should conspire to take that territory.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from California has made a very serious statement regarding Japan. I should like to ask him if he speaks by the record; if he is positive of the fact that these negotiations, or attempted negotiations, were pending or entered into by Japan?

My reason for doing this is that, if my recollection serves me aright, the Japanese Government at the time denied that fact, and did it officially; and if, as a matter of fact, that denial was not a sincere one, then the Senator's statement might become of the utmost diplomatic importance.

Mr. PHELAN. There is always a hesitancy in this body, I know, to discuss international relations in open session, but it seems that this is the period of open diplomacy. I would ask that there be spread upon the records the Lodge resolution, which speaks for itself. In a previous discussion in this body

I raised the point that the Lodge resolution was directed against the threatened aggression by Japanese colonists in this very same matter, affecting Lower California. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] said that Japan was not mentioned in his resolution; and then I directly interrogated him, and said, "Had you not Japan in your mind when you introduced the resolution and when the Senate passed it?" and he said yes. Japan was the only country spoken of at that time. That is an open secret.

I do not say, nor did he say, that the Japanese Government itself had made this aggressive step, but that Japanese merchants and colonizers had sought the acquisition of a large tract of land around Magdalena Bay, which is a highly desirable acquisition for our naval operations—that is another open secret—and that therefore the Japanese, through their merchants or through their colonizers, must be held responsible. It is not by any involvement of the Japanese Government that this matter has come to the surface; but American citizens might in some other country have made an attempt to acquire land contrary to the proprietary rights or the peace and contentment of a foreign country, and protests might be made to this Government against the acts of its citizens; and this Government could, I think, by the exercise of its authority, prevent its citizens, against such a protest, from acquiring or seeking to acquire such territory. In a much greater degree the Japanese Government has control over its nationals, and I do not know that the Japanese Government took any action after the passage of the Lodge resolution. All I know is that their merchants or colonizers desisted from the attempt.

I do not wish at this time to bring up any matter which would in any way mar the entente cordiale which exists between the nations seeking a settlement of greater questions in other parts of the world; nor do I desire to say that the State of California is interested in this matter at all. All I know of it is what has come from the speech of the Senator from Arizona, who introduced the resolution, and I do not know that it is timely at this moment to discuss the proposition; but since it is before the Senate it is well that the circumstances surrounding the Lodge resolution should be known, if not authenticated. I am sorry that the Senator from Massachusetts is not here.

Mr. PHELAN subsequently said: Mr. President, on December 12, 1916, during the discussion of the immigration bill, the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] said that the Magdalena Bay resolution which bore my name mentioned the Japanese by name. I knew it did not, but I thought it was just as well to read it into the Record:

"Resolved, That when any harbor or other place in the American Continent is so situated that the occupation thereof for naval or military purposes might threaten the communications or the safety of the United States the Government of the United States could not see without grave concern the possession of such harbor or other place by any corporation or association which has such a relation to another government not American as to give that government practical power of control for national purposes."

No name is mentioned.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, whereas no name has been mentioned, of course the Senator will not deny that he intended to refer to the Japanese.

Mr. LODGE. I have not referred to any Government. Of course the Japanese Government was the one that had been mentioned in that connection. Other governments had also been mentioned.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I certainly do not want to interrupt the Senator from Arizona, who is making a most interesting speech. I merely wish to say that I have no desire to shrink from a public discussion of our diplomatic relations with any country. I simply called attention to the fact that my recollection was that the Japanese Government had officially contradicted the rumors and statements which were made, and some of which were quite current immediately preceding the introduction and passage of the Lodge resolution.

So far as the general proposition is concerned, there is no difference between us. I do not think the United States ought to permit any country—Japan or some smaller or weaker nationality—to obtain any foothold whatever upon the littorals of the Pacific Ocean, or indeed upon the shores of any ocean bounding the Western Hemisphere. That can be said to be almost the universal opinion, I think, of Americans everywhere.

I am much obliged to the Senator for permitting this interruption.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point as part of my remarks a statement from the Department of Agriculture concerning the rainfall in certain portions of the country under discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POLLOCK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Average monthly and annual rainfall (inches).

Stations.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	June.
La Paz, Lower California.....	0.17	0.04				0.18
Santa Rosalia, Lower California.....	.47	.50	0.23	0.06		
San Diego, Cal. ¹	2.00	1.96	1.70	.74	0.41	.03
Yuma, Ariz. ²43	.60	.35	.10	.03	

Stations.	July.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual.
La Paz, Lower California.....	1.19	2.05	0.93	0.98	0.19	0.70	6.49
Santa Rosalia, Lower California.....	.61	.17	.27	.87		.11	3.29
San Diego, Cal. ¹06	.46	.83	1.82	10.01
Yuma, Ariz. ²12	.35	.16	.19	.32	.45	3.10

¹San Diego near northwestern border of Lower California.

²Yuma at northeastern boundary of Lower California.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, as the Senator has been interrupted, I should like to ask how many inhabitants there are in this territory which he proposes to purchase?

Mr. ASHURST. Let me answer the Senator's question as follows:

In that part of the State of Sonora comprehended in this resolution, the northwestern part, it is very difficult to determine how many, or perhaps I should say how few, persons there are; probably 500. My judgment is that there are not that many; but in the peninsula, which is nearly 800 miles long and has an average width of 100 miles, there are in the northern district about 7,500 persons and in the southern district about 17,500, or 25,000 in all—not as many as there were 25 years ago; not as many, in fact, as there were 10 years ago.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to ask the Senator if he contemplates that in carrying out this action, if it is done, the policy of self-determination would be invoked?

Mr. ASHURST. Personally, Mr. President, I am very strongly of the opinion that the views, wishes, and desires of those persons inhabiting the country proposed to be purchased should be taken into consideration; and it must be assumed—indeed, I am sure that every Senator here would assume—I never would have introduced the resolution had I not been quite certain, from my study of the question for six years past, that the sentiment is practically unanimous for admission and annexation to the United States. Strange as it may seem, since I introduced the resolution, which was only on the second of this month, I have received nearly 1,200 letters on this project, and I know of but one that is opposed to it. I will ask leave to have read now part of a letter I have received from one of the most prominent men in the United States.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that he has received that number of letters from the inhabitants of the country?

Mr. ASHURST. No; but from inhabitants of the United States who are familiar with the sentiments and familiar with the views of the people in the territory sought to be acquired. I will ask the Secretary to read this excerpt, because it is characteristic of a large number of letters I have received from people who are familiar with that district.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

I note your introduction of a resolution requesting the President to begin negotiations with the Mexican Republic for the purchase of the Lower California Peninsula and all that portion of the Mexican State of Sonora lying north of the parallel 31° 20' north latitude, and, as a citizen, wish to express my cordial approval of your proposal.

I am somewhat familiar, by personal observation, with the great possibilities of the Lower California Peninsula in the development of its mineral wealth, its fisheries, and, to a limited extent, agriculture. The importance of the magnificent harbor of Magdalena Bay has been so often emphasized that it is usually the first argument advanced for the acquisition of the peninsula by the United States, but its natural resources, its practically complete isolation geographically from the remainder of the Mexican Republic, and the sparseness of its population at present, all make your proposal most advantageous and feasible for the United States and no particular loss to Mexico. In fact, I am led to believe that the majority of the inhabitants of the peninsula would welcome annexation to the United States. United States currency is the principal medium of exchange in circulation in that territory at the present time.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, a very able Senator has just remarked sotto voce—and he is thoughtful in it—that if I am not careful I will make out this tract of country so valuable that Mexico will not part with it. Now, that is only an apparent danger. Mexico is almost a derelict. It is not offensive to a sister nation to say that, because it is a fact. It has about the same chance of floating into a harbor as the ordinary

derelict out on the physical ocean has, and Mexico needs help. She needs not only good advice but credits as well. But howsoever valuable this district—this peninsula—may be, it is not valuable to Mexico. It is only a vermiform appendix to Mexico—a source of danger. She can not appreciate its value. Mexico has not that stimulus of the progressive ideals that the American pioneer has. It may be valuable to us, but not to Mexico. When the first European set his foot on these shores, the mines were just as rich as they are to-day; the forests and the fields and the noble and placid harbors and rivers were there, but the dominating, pulsating spirit of civilization had to enter to make it valuable. It is valuable, yes, in natural resources, but it will never be valuable to Mexico.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I am wondering if the Senator thinks we will have as much success in colonizing and developing Lower California as we have had in the case of Alaska, which we have owned for more than 50 years; and yet it was stated yesterday, before a committee of which I am a member, that there were less than half the number of inhabitants there to-day that there were two years ago.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. How about Texas?

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to add to the Senator's statement that the great bulk of Alaska has been withdrawn from public settlement.

Mr. WEEKS. I know the reason for it, of course.

Mr. THOMAS. It is being held for posterity.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. It is being conserved for eternity.

Mr. ASHURST. But is there a Senator, is there a Member of the House, who would vote to return Alaska? No. Secretary Seward—a man of great vision and large grasp of public affairs—at midnight learned that he could conclude a treaty for the purchase of Alaska, and before the sun gilded the eastern sky the next morning he and the Russian minister concluded the treaty. At that time distinguished men opposed the project in the strongest possible terms. I will read some of their statements.

Mr. Orange Ferriss, of New York, said:

The people of this country do not want these Russian possessions. If submitted to them they would reject the treaty by a majority of millions. Alaska, with the Aleutian Islands, is an inhospitable, wretched, and God-forsaken region, worth nothing, but a positive injury and encumbrance as a colony of the United States.

Mr. Washburne, of Wisconsin, said:

The country is absolutely without value. * * * I tell gentlemen who go for Alaska that Greenland to-day is a better purchase than Alaska.

Mr. Hiram Price, of Iowa, said:

Now that we have got it and can not give it away or lose it, I hope we will keep it under military rule and get along with as little expense as possible. It is a dead loss to us anyway, and the more expense we incur the worse it is for the country and the people.

Mr. B. F. Butler, of Massachusetts, July 7, 1868, said:

If we are to pay for her (Russia's) friendship this amount, I desire to give her the \$7,200,000 and let her keep Alaska. * * * I have no doubt that any time within the last 20 years we could have had Alaska for the asking. I have heard it was so stated in the Cabinets of two Presidents, provided we would have taken it as a gift. But no man, except one insane enough to buy the earthquakes in St. Thomas and the ice fields in Greenland, could be found to agree to any other terms for its acquisition to the country.

Mr. Benjamin F. Loan, of Missouri, said:

The acquisition of this inhospitable and barren waste would never add one dollar to the wealth of our country or furnish homes to our people. To suppose that anyone would willingly leave the mild climate and fruitful soil of the United States, with its newspapers and churches, its railroads and commerce, its civilization and refinement, to seek a home among the Aleuts * * * is simply to suppose such person insane.

Mr. Williams, of Pennsylvania, said:

Have the people desired it? (The purchase of Alaska.) Not a sensible man among them had ever suggested it. The whole country exclaimed at once, when it was made known to it, against the ineffable folly, if not the wanton profligacy, of the whole transaction. There is no man here, I think, who would have advised it. I doubt whether there are 20 in this House who would be willing to vote for it now, but for the single reason that the contract has been made.

Mr. Washburne, of Illinois, January 13, 1869—after the Territory had been purchased, speaking on the bill to provide a government for the same—said:

The accounts which we receive from that Territory of the sickness and suffering of the people who are sent there show conclusively that it will never be inhabited to any considerable extent by white men.

Mr. Ferriss, of New York, speaking on the same bill, moved to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the President be authorized to bind the United States by treaty to pay the sum of \$7,200,000 to any respectable European, Asiatic, or African power which will accept a cession of the Territory of Alaska.

One statesman after another inveighed against the purchase of Alaska, and yet it has been a most remarkably fortunate purchase. Instead of "Seward's folly" and "Seward's ice

box," no greater domain than Alaska was ever acquired by honorable statesmanship.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I want to add there, also, that a good deal of the objection to the purchase of Alaska was due to unfamiliarity with its value. The Senator of course remembers that Mr. Webster, one of America's greatest statesmen, declared upon the floor of this Chamber that the Rocky Mountains were a barrier that had been created by the Almighty for the protection of Anglo-Saxon civilization; that the country lying to the west of the Rocky Mountain range consisted of icebergs and sand banks, barren mountains and plains and deserts, inhospitable to a population of any kind, and that there was not a decent harbor upon the Pacific coast; and I think he added that he would not give a dollar for the whole of Oregon. Certainly an eminent statesman like Mr. Webster making assertions of that kind rather excuses the repetition of similar statements in regard to other sections of the continent. We all know better now.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I do not wish the Senator from Arizona to think from my inquiry that I am hostile to what he is proposing, but I did intend to reflect on the vision and on the legislation of Congress which has been enacted in connection with the development of Alaska. I think it is a serious reflection on the American Congress that that great country, with its great values, is so tied up that it can not be successfully developed.

Mr. THOMAS. I agree with the Senator on that. We are not in disagreement at all on that point.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arizona yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not want to interrupt the Senator to the extent of discussing the matter that has just been mentioned by the Senator from Massachusetts. I merely wish to remark, however, that there are very large areas of rich land in Alaska which have been surveyed by the General Land Office and are open for homestead, and there are some advantages in connection with it in comparison with homesteads in the continental United States. In Alaska a man can take 320 acres as a homestead. There is something else wrong with the situation in Alaska besides the question of locking up the land or the resources. A great number of settlers went upon the rich lands that I have referred to and took up homesteads. A few of them are there yet, but a large number of them have come out. It is not because the lands are locked up, but for other reasons, the discussion of which I shall reserve for some future occasion.

Mr. ASHURST. Whatever be the reason, the purchase of Alaska was an honorable purchase, and at that time it was generally believed that Russia had the best of the bargain. But the world knows that the timber, gold, coal, oil, and I will say furs, in Alaska are practically inexhaustible; and no doubt, under improved methods and intensive farming, Alaska will yet be a great agricultural country and an apple country.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator yield for a suggestion?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. When we bought Alaska it was practically all public domain. Can the Senator from Arizona inform the Senate with regard to Lower California, how much of the territory is public domain; or, in other words, how much of it has passed into private ownership?

Mr. ASHURST. I have not a map here showing the grants. Let me answer the Senator by saying that when the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was concluded with Mexico there was a provision that valid grants which had previously been made, whether the grantees deraigned title from Spain or from Mexico, should be recognized. All over California there were vast grants of land the titles to which have been held inviolate in the grantee and his heirs and successors. The Spanish Government and the Mexican Government made grants. There were some grants in my own State.

There are some grants that have been made to vast tracts in Lower California. I am speaking now without accurate information, but I would judge that the grants that have been made do not embrace and cover over 15 per cent of the area of the peninsula, and there are no grants except two very small ones here [indicating Sonora on the map] covering that part of Sonora.

Mr. CUMMINS. I gave some study to the subject a short while ago, and I think the Senator from Arizona is rather underestimating the area of the lands which have been granted either by Spain or by some government of Mexico to private persons

or corporations. But I am not suggesting this because I am opposed to the resolution. In fact, I have long been of the opinion that we ought to try hard to buy it, and if we could not buy it we ought to take it; but that would not be in accord with the universal brotherhood of man and the reign of justice which is now supposed to prevail throughout the world.

I was reminded of the fact that a large part of the valuable territory of Lower California was in private ownership by the suggestion of the Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN]. The truth is that after the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] introduced his resolution which related to Magdalena Bay it developed in the course of the debate that the land around Magdalena Bay and which it was feared might fall into the hands of Japanese subjects was actually owned by American citizens, and the fear was that American citizens owning the vast concessions might part with them to Japanese citizens or subjects. That makes it all the more necessary that if possible we should control Lower California.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator for his interruption. When we come to consider the land grants made by Mexico it is quite a serious task to examine the titles. There is a man in my town who spoke about a "Mexican airplane propeller," and he said that we ought to have it, as the propeller made 10,000 revolutions a minute. They have a great many revolutions in Mexico. Possibly the de facto government to-day will make a grant and another government to-morrow will revoke it and make another grant, but when you come to valid, substantive grants that eminent lawyers, such as the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] and other Senators, would go into their law offices, study, and then say were valid and legal grants, I should say but 15 or 20 per cent of the area of Lower California is included in such grants.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WATSON. Something of that kind I had in mind awhile ago when I suggested to the Senator if we would buy Lower California we might buy trouble. My understanding is that Mexico to-day is probably in as serious an internal condition as she has ever been; that there is seething revolution in 14 of her 27 States; that Carranza controls only a limited portion of Mexico, and that other generals are in control of other portions of Mexico. If some rebel general in arms against the Carranza Government is in control of the part of Mexico that lies next to Lower California, and we were to take over Lower California, would we not be taking over a fight?

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Senator's question has arisen, but I am assuming, and I think I have a right to assume, that when our State Department brings its diplomatic, literary, and historical resources to work on this question, the department would take pains to conclude a treaty that would preclude all reasonable fear of trouble with Mexico. Doubtless there would be some junta in Mexico that might be considerable in number that would oppose the treaty. If they could make themselves felt in the Mexican Congress they could defeat the ratification of the treaty, but I do not believe it would be a concern of ours if we made an honest purchase with clean hands and paid a fair, substantial sum of money to the appropriate persons who were the de facto and acting authority.

Mr. WATSON. But this is the question, to further pursue it: It is not that we could not make a treaty with Carranza, inasmuch as we have a representative there and his Government has a representative here, both duly accredited. Therefore, we could make a binding, valid treaty. It is not that, but Carranza himself is unable to take possession, I understand, of Lower California. There are roving bands of guerrillas and brigands, or there are generals in command of these roving armies. Villa is down there on that coast somewhere, and Felix Dias is down there somewhere, and half a dozen other fellows at the head of those bands. If Carranza, at this time President of Mexico, is unable to control that portion of the country, how could he give us a warranty deed for it and then defend it as against those people?

Mr. ASHURST. The Federal Government of Mexico for more than 10 years has not pretended to have any authority or jurisdiction over it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. The Mexican Government owns it.

Mr. ASHURST. The Mexican Government, as my colleague says, however, owns it.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely; that is all there is in it.

Mr. ASHURST. That to me is an objection so hazy and so nebulous that I hardly consider it as an objection. I believe as Andrew Jackson believed, that we can deal with de facto governments. They may have a new government every day, but that is not our concern. I would deal with the de facto gov-

ernment if I knew it would change to-morrow. We have a right under the law of nations to deal with the de facto government, although it may be supplanted to-morrow.

Mr. WATSON. In other words, here is what I want to find out from the Senator. He would make a treaty with Mexico, if he could make a satisfactory treaty, to take over the territory and then go and take it regardless of consequences.

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly, so long as the will of Mexico were not overthrown and no injustice practiced, and there was no deception. Does the Senator think that because a few cut-throats and outlaws who neither know nor respect the law of Mexico nor the law of the United States objected that our Federal Government should withhold any action simply because a few bandits object to civilization and law and order?

Mr. WATSON. No, Mr. President, the Senator believes just as I do, except that I have been trying to get him to say it.

Mr. ASHURST. I have just said it.

Mr. WATSON. Precisely. I would long ago have protected American property and American life and American interests in Mexico.

Mr. ASHURST. I said here long ago if I had charge of affairs Mexican outlaws there would get grapeshot instead of grape juice. I said that long ago, but I am not in charge of the State Department.

Mr. MYERS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. ASHURST. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. Does it not seem to the Senator that it would be well for us to pay the Republic of Colombia for what we took from her before we go to buying other territory?

Mr. ASHURST. I am in thorough accord with the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] and with the eminent Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] in their views that we ought to pay Colombia for the territory we took. I am not a believer in the idea that because we are great, powerful, and opulent we ought to take territory by the strong arm. We ought to buy what we wish to acquire.

Mr. CUMMINS. Will the Senator permit a question?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes, sir; I will.

Mr. CUMMINS. What are we buying from Mexico? If a very large part of that valuable territory is in the ownership of private persons, what do we buy from the Republic of Mexico?

Mr. ASHURST. We buy the sovereignty.

Mr. CUMMINS. We can not buy the sovereignty. How can we pay for sovereignty? Sovereignty, of course, is power, for it depends upon the will of the persons who are in power.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator is a statesman whose just fame is known in every portion of this land. The Senator knows we bought Florida, we acquired Louisiana by purchase, we annexed Texas, we made the Gadsden Purchase, and in each there were large private interests involved. In the case of California, a large part of that State was in private ownership in the shape of land grants.

Mr. CUMMINS. There was a time in the development of the world in civilization in which sovereignty was bought, and I am not particularly critical about that, because it was in harmony with the thought at that time, but nowadays we do not look upon the purchase of mere sovereignty as a very appropriate thing. In all the other purchases mentioned by the Senator from Arizona while there were private interests there was very large public property as well. Take the Louisiana Purchase. There comparatively few people were on a great public domain. I was wondering whether the Senator from Arizona had in his mind to pay Mexico for the full value of all the property in Lower California.

Mr. ASHURST. Well, of course, I am asking the Senate to pass the resolution requesting the President to negotiate a treaty. If I were Secretary of State, I might negotiate one sort of a treaty and somebody else might negotiate another sort of a treaty, but the question of the right of purchase of domain by the United States is well settled. It was settled in the Louisiana Purchase that the United States has a right to purchase territory and to erect that territory into States later on. We purchased the Danish West Indies only a year or two ago. These purchases afford an abundant precedent and example and authority for the purchase of this domain.

Before I leave this question, let me say, in reply to the question by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], that I do not wish to be understood as inferring that there is a vast deal of lawlessness and disorder in the peninsula. On the contrary, under a rather moderate, beneficent, and prudent administration of the present governor there, considering the people that he has to deal with do not always understand law and order, there is remarkable tranquillity, considering that it is a part of Mexico, because Mexico implies the very reverse of tranquillity.

Mr. WATSON. I do not think there is any question about that part of it; but the point I was making is that Carranza

is in a very precarious condition now, with all these revolutions surging about him, and the probabilities are that he would not be willing to make a treaty, and if he did it would occasion another insurrection and another revolution and more trouble.

Mr. ASHURST. What are a few insurrections, more or less, in Mexico?

Mr. WATSON. Not of the slightest importance on earth; but the point I am considering is that if we start then we shall have to finish the job.

Mr. ASHURST. Would that be difficult?

Mr. WATSON. No; it would be entirely agreeable to me; and I am trying to get the Senator from Arizona to make a bold declaration of it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. To go into denunciation of Mexico?

Mr. WATSON. No; not a denunciation of Mexico; but in the way of protecting American interests and American life and property in Mexico we have not done what we ought to have done.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. If you proceed along that line and go into that discussion at this particular time, I claim to know something about that border down there.

Mr. WATSON. I have no doubt the Senator does.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I really know something of the relations of Mexico to our people down there. If you are in an effort to beat the resolution by raising a denunciation on this floor, an adverse criticism against men who think they are responding to a very unjust action on our part, you may succeed in raising such a spirit there that the end which we are trying to accomplish may be dissipated in the very start.

Mr. WATSON. I want to say to the Senator that I am not attempting to defeat the resolution at all. I am simply trying to follow to its logical conclusion the argument of the Senator's colleague who is advancing this proposition. We are having constant trouble in Mexico. The Senator knows about that. How many soldiers are there to-day on guard along the border of Mexico?

Mr. ASHURST. If you had 40,000 you might not have too many. What is the use to get off into a discussion of another question? I am willing to admit, and no candid man will deny, that neither life nor property has been safe in Mexico for many years. Is not that a bold declaration?

Mr. WATSON. That is satisfactory.

Mr. ASHURST. Will the Senator now be bold enough, I know he is honest enough, to admit there is a de facto government in Mexico with which the United States could deal under international law?

Mr. WATSON. Certainly.

Mr. ASHURST. There is a de facto government in Mexico with which all nations may honorably deal. I am asking the Senate to adopt a resolution looking to an honest and fair purchase from the de facto government of a tract of land that we need and that is valuable to us and that is not worth anything to Mexico. I hope now the underbrush is all cleared away in this debate. Why is the peninsula valuable to us? I have spoken of its magnificent harbor, Magdalena Bay, on the Pacific coast, and of the Bay of La Paz on its Gulf coast. It has numerous islands on the Pacific and the Gulf coast where an oriental enemy could colonize and set up a naval base or a military base. Mexico is unable, unwilling to resist.

Magdalena Bay is valuable to us. The Panama Canal, built by American enterprise, will become, when reconstruction shall have been over, the stream of great currents of trade with the Orient. Is it not timely and proper that American statesmen, American Senators, should give consideration to a proposition which puts American possession 800 miles nearer the Panama Canal? The Panama Canal is the very pentralia of our peace and security. Just so it is unthinkable that American Senators would permit such a valuable—I might say invaluable—asset as the Panama Canal to be inadequately secured against seizure and against destruction.

The canal is open to the world upon the same terms, but the duty is on us nevertheless to guard and control the canal.

The Pacific Ocean is a theater of activity that the most remote excursion of the imagination can not describe—a theater of commerce, perhaps a theater of war. Who dares to say what it will not be in the future? It should be our part and our duty as American citizens to guard the Pacific in every way. When the fleet went around the world in 1908 it stopped at Magdalena Bay to test its guns by target practice in that magnificent harbor. Mexico does not want Magdalena Bay, can not use it, does not appreciate it. The Mexicans have not the stimulus that Americans have and never will appreciate it. Are we, therefore, to sit here year in and year out because we have hesitancy about dealing with a de facto government? I am not afraid, I will say to the Senator, to deal with a de facto authority. Their acts are valid. I am afraid, however, to do an

injustice or a wrong. I am afraid to take it; not but what we could get it; they could offer but a feeble resistance, but a fair man is afraid to do wrong.

Now, there is another vital point in this question. It is seldom appreciated. It is very little investigated. It involves the control of the great Colorado River, the Nile of the West. The Colorado sends down each year 17,000,000 acre-feet of water. What do I mean by that? I mean it sends down enough water each year to cover 17,000,000 acres with water 1 foot deep. During the period from 1903 to 1914, 215,000,000 acre-feet of water in the Colorado River passed Hardyville, Ariz. The Colorado River is called the Nile of the West. The Nile has 68,000,000 acre-feet of water coming down each year. The Colorado has 17,000,000 acre-feet of water coming down each year. The Nile, therefore, has four times more water than has the Colorado. The Nile basin has three times the area the Colorado basin has, but the Colorado River is doing only one-fifteenth the irrigation that the Nile is doing. There is the Nile, with only four times more water, with only three times more irrigable land—the land is about the same in character—doing fifteen times more irrigating than the Colorado. To obtain the same amount of irrigation per acre-foot as the Nile the Colorado should irrigate eight times what it is now irrigating—eight times 300,000, or 2,400,000 acres.

So, Mr. President, if a treaty can be concluded for the purchase of this tract of land on the northwestern coast of Sonora and the peninsula of Lower California, 2,000,000 acres more of land so rich that no industrious man needs over 40 acres of it to become opulent may be irrigated. The Deglet Noor dates, worth \$2 a pound, and the long-staple cotton, which my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has seen and will say measures up and staples with the best cotton in the world, the orange, the lemon, the lime—all the fruits and flowers could be grown there; whereas if Mexico retains it it will be a howling desert, a cactus-infested land.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. Just let me finish the sentence.

Therefore, is it surprising that I urge the President to conclude a treaty for the honest purchase of this land? We speak of our soldiers coming home, and of providing land for the soldiers, a very worthy movement. The lands must be obtained somewhere. If the Colorado River, with its 10,000,000 acre-feet of water now running to waste each year, can have its waters turned out on this fertile land can you imagine anything more romantic and yet more practical than the making of this desert to bloom with flowers and fruit and with the environments of a refined civilization? I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator has perhaps done so, but if not I hope he will emphasize the fact that the utilization of this water to the extent he has described necessitates the construction of improvements upon Mexican soil. I think that is the point of divergence.

Mr. ASHURST. That is the very point.

Mr. THOMAS. The Imperial Valley, therefore, is very largely dependent upon Mexican good will, or cooperation, if you please, or both, for its continued prosperity, its water coming from the Colorado River.

Mr. ASHURST. The Senator has stated it so succinctly that I need not refer to it further, except to say that he is absolutely correct. Some parts of Imperial Valley, where the agricultural crop is worth more than \$100,000,000 annually, lie in the extreme northern part of the peninsula.

Irrigationists in the peninsula are dependent upon the moderation of the governor, whom I have just described three times as being a prudent man. I will not say that he desires or will be glad to see the annexation of the peninsula to the United States, because I have no authority to say that, but I believe it just the same.

Mr. President, passing on from the point I tried to make, of the necessity of controlling the territory of the Colorado River, it is a snow-fed river, as is the Nile; it rises in June and July; it would be necessary to have storage dams some 200 miles up the river to gather in and conserve and hold this vast quantity of water that rushes and wastes itself in the gulf. This affords another reason why we should pass the resolution. It affords another reason why the executive branch of the Government should conclude a treaty with Mexico looking toward the acquisition of this land. This is not a new subject. It has been a subject of frequent discussion, of diplomatic negotiations and otherwise.

Mr. FLETCHER. Perhaps the Senator has stated it, but I would be glad if he would state again about the length of the peninsula.

Mr. ASHURST. The length of the peninsula is about 800 miles. Its greatest width is 150 miles; its narrowest point is 40 miles, and its average width is about 100 miles.

Mr. FLETCHER. There are harbors on the Pacific side?

Mr. ASHURST. On the Pacific side there are several harbors, and there is the very famous Magdalena Bay Harbor. On the gulf side there is a remarkably fine harbor in the southern portion of the peninsula, La Paz.

Mr. FLETCHER. What is the depth of the water at Magdalena Bay?

Mr. ASHURST. I have never been there, but I am informed that any sort of ships now built may dock in Magdalena Harbor.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I understand there are over 45 feet of water there.

Mr. ASHURST. Now, Mr. President, one other question. We stand before the world with all nations seeking our favor because of what we may call our magnanimity and our patriotism. We have stridently asserted—I think the word is correct—that we are the friends of Mexico. All right. Let us see whether or not we are at heart. Mexico—torn, distracted, almost a shipwreck among the nations, overrun by bandits and cutthroats, with only a small percentage of population understanding the blessings of freedom, misled in large part by German propaganda—is a nation that should excite our sympathy as much as it ought to incur our just displeasure.

We are the friends of Mexico, we say. What does Mexico need most of all? She has all the law that can be imagined. Name a law that Mexico has not. Laws alone do not make a nation. Ideals, justice, moderation, frugality, sobriety, order, and industry make a nation. The stimulus of gold and enterprise makes a nation. Mexico needs money. She needs money to pay the interest on her bonded indebtedness. She has an enormous floating indebtedness. I do not pretend to assert how many millions of dollars Mexico owes the United States for lives and property of persons destroyed in the United States by Mexicans. I will not even venture upon the still larger question of trying to determine how much money Mexico owes citizens of the United States for the destruction of life and property in Mexico; but with the stimulus of the money that she will receive from this purchase she can pay the interest on her national debt, discharge or liquidate at least a part of the obligations she owes to our citizens. She may then rebuild her railroad bridges, build boats, and set herself aright before the great family of nations, and to discharge one's obligations is the most substantial way of setting one's self right. Mexico needs the stimulus which American enterprise and American money honestly paid to her can give her.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. I simply want to ask whether, in the opinion of the Senator from Arizona, the pride—proper pride, perhaps—in which Mexico indulges to-day will not be so great that they will wipe aside all of these incentives to sell and refuse to sell, for the present, at least?

Mr. ASHURST. Well, the Mexicans are a very proud people, and I for one am inclined to respect their punctilious pride; but I am convinced that it is within the diplomatic and the literary resources not only of the present Secretary of State, but the Secretaries of State whom we have had, and those who are to come afterwards, to negotiate, in time, a treaty with Mexico looking toward that end. It will not be an easy task; undoubtedly it will be a difficult task; it is not impossible of accomplishment, and we should never stop; but with all proper insistence, and upon every proper occasion, we should try to assist our State Department in making this purchase.

Mr. PAGE. And the Senator believes that it is possible to make the purchase within the next few years?

Mr. ASHURST. I think it is entirely possible to make this purchase within the next 10 years.

Now, Mr. President, before I go to another subject—

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. Has the Senator any estimate as to what it would cost the United States Government to purchase this peninsula?

Mr. ASHURST. I have no such estimate. I have had conversations with eminent people who are supposed to understand the matter and to speak for some Mexican authorities, but I am unable to answer the Senator.

Let me say this: The Gadsden Purchase, which embraced the southern part of Arizona and a little part of New Mexico, was concluded in 1853, and it was proposed to pay \$15,000,000 for that purchase. The Senate, however, rejected the treaty, because they said the sum was too large. However, a reconsideration was had, and a treaty was adopted paying Mexico \$10,000,000 for that purchase. I have no idea that the land in question in this case could be acquired for any such small sum.

Mr. SHAFROTH. But the Senator's idea is that negotiation could reduce the price to a reasonable sum?

Mr. ASHURST. I think negotiations could reduce the price to a reasonable sum, but we need not hope to acquire this tract of land for such a comparatively small sum as was paid for the Gadsden Purchase. Now, before I leave that particular subject, I desire to discuss one other question.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator from Arizona leaves that subject, referring to the question of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], in reference to the pride of Mexico, I desire to say that it seems to me, however delicate the pride of the Mexicans might be, or whatever might be their sensitiveness, this transaction could be carried on in perfect harmony with their pride and national spirit. It has been only a few months since we have acquired from Denmark the Virgin Islands.

Mr. ASHURST. I was going to refer to that, but I am glad the Senator from Oklahoma has done so.

Mr. GORE. Denmark is a very proud and sensitive nation and commands the respect of the world. It is not long since Russia, at that time one of the most powerful nations on the globe, sold Alaska to the United States. Spain at one time obtained Louisiana from France, but subsequently ceded it back to France, and France ceded it to the United States. Great Britain for 20 years—from 1762 to 1783—owned the Floridas, but she subsequently ceded them back to Spain. Such cession is not an unusual transaction, and is perfectly compatible with national pride.

Mr. ASHURST. I thank the Senator.

Now, Mr. President, on this large map [indicating]—I doubt if Senators can see it—I have marked on the little strip of Sonora, in the northwestern part of the State of Sonora, the words "potash, sodium, sulphates." There is a rainless portion of our western world. On the Pacific side of the peninsula there are numerous small islands bearing sea-bird guano and carrying an important percentage of potassium nitrate.

Where did I get that information? I have never been there, though I have been here [indicating Sonora on the map], but I have never been upon the peninsula. I repeat, where did I get that information? From Germany; from German reservists. The United States Government did not know it; but the German reservists, spying out of this country, looking for a place of refuge, discovered the guano, the potash, and sodium, and the information was sent to Germany. A citizen of Arizona, whose name I am not at liberty to mention, obtained the information—which our State Department did not have—that this land was rich in the same kind of nitrates that are found in Chile, and that these numerous islands were covered, and have been covered in the centuries gone by, with great deposits of bird guano, carrying an important percentage of nitrate of potassium. This unknown land has been a refuge, a hiding place for our enemies; and Mexico, even had she been willing to do so, would have been unable to resist the aggression of our enemies in the late war. That is all the more reason why American statesmanship, care, and provision for the future should be turned to the acquisition of that tract of land, which, I repeat for nearly the twentieth time, is and always will be of no real substantial value to civilization while it is controlled by Mexico.

I was just about to reach a point regarding the purchase of the Virgin Islands when my friend the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] interrupted me. It has been said that the agitation of this question—indeed, I read it in a newspaper yesterday—was untimely while peace negotiations were going on. Untimely! It is the very model of prudence, magnanimity, and fair dealing. It sets an example to the other nations of the world. When Germany, with her mailed fist and spiked helmet, was overrunning Belgium, destroying Poland, and starving Serbia, the United States Government, the most opulent, the most puissant nation the world ever saw, was honorably buying the Virgin Islands from a small but a noble power. The United States Government, while the war was on, placed herself into juxtaposition with Germany—Germany, with her spiked helmet and poison gas, *taking*, and the United States Government honorably *buying* what she wished, thereby setting a noble example to the other nations of the earth.

What better news could be sent to the peace conference at Versailles than that the United States is contemplating the honorable purchase—not the forcible seizure—of some land which it needs and which its neighbor does not need?

Now, as to this so-called sentiment that nations never wish to change their frontier line, let me say that all national frontiers are subject to constant fluctuations and will forever be shrinking and expanding. National frontiers can no more remain delimited and static than can the coast lines of oceans, for they are those indefinable shores where break and beat the restless and turbulent seas of life.

The frontiers of any country are the boundaries that separate it from its neighbors. Sometimes the frontier lines are

great natural topographical features, such as mountain chains or rivers; sometimes they are arbitrary lines shifted from time to time by the caprice of rulers or the aggressions of the more powerful; but the frontier lines of our Nation in continental United States have never been shifted at the caprice of any ruler. Justice, fair play, and honest purchases alone have characterized our acquisitions of territory. Our frontier line, like the receding shadow line of the sundial which marks the hourly passage of time, has receded toward the west under the influence of the advancing sun of civilization until after a long journey it has reached the shores of the great Pacific. The recession of our frontier is the most important and most interesting fact of our national history, embracing a series of events as brilliant in statesmanship as they are unstained by wrong or injustice.

The first settlements were made on our eastern coast 300 years ago, and these 300 years of progressive development have a history as brilliant as it is varied in its coloring—like a gorgeous piece of tapestry, some of its threads are golden, some are silver, and some are crimson with the lifeblood of the pioneer freely shed in his contest with savage beasts and savage men; but they are interwoven into one picture of civil and religious freedom such as mankind has never in all the ages looked upon before. So this acquisition of Lower California by the United States and the obtaining of the control of the Colorado River by the United States must likewise, as I know it will, be accomplished without wrong or injustice toward our weaker neighbor, who is at this time debilitated, torn, and distracted.

Mexico needs gold; it needs that stimulus to its enterprises which gold alone can give. Gold will assist Mexico to rehabilitate herself. With ample credits she would be able to pay her floating obligations and interest on her bonded debts, bring about some semblance of law and order and give security to life and property. If we are really a friend of Mexico, as we have so stridently proclaimed, here is an opportunity to show our friendship with something more substantial than words. Let us show our friendship by concluding a fair bargain in accepting from Mexico this vast tract of land which she does not need, can not police, and which, if she retains, would be for the next hundred years the same desert waste it has been during all the past.

The public man who omits to grasp an opportunity which may, in the future be of benefit or safety to those who live under our stainless flag is recreant to his trust.

Our duty is plain. In these troublous times we are in charge of the Nation's destiny, holding the most sacred deposit ever confided to human hands, should not shrink nor shrink. If we perform these duties, glory will be our portion; if we fail, it will be to our shame. There is no remorse so deep, so poignant, so inveterate, as that which comes from the consciousness that we have failed at a supreme crisis to avail ourselves of an opportunity to perform a real and needful public service to our country, and there is no happiness more sustaining, more enduring, or more unselfish than the consciousness that we have met in a worthy manner the responsibilities upon us.

Fortune, success, and opportunity soar aloft on high and rapid wing. They must be seized as they pass by. It is a difficult task to overtake them once they have left us behind or found us asleep or afraid.

All success, whether of a nation, a political party, a business firm, or an individual, comes only from exacting toil and diligent labor, coupled with the ability to recognize an opportunity, however vagrant and disguised it may present itself. The individual, the party, the State that succeeds is the postmaster, not the postponer. Pass this resolution and the Senate will have the sympathy and support of all honest, reasonable, and patriotic people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What disposition does the Senator from Arizona desire made of his resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for not over 10 minutes to the resolution.

Mr. ASHURST. At the conclusion of the remarks of my colleague, if no Senator desires to address himself to the resolution, I shall ask that it be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the question that has entertained the Senate this afternoon is one as old as our War with Mexico. Time and again in my career since I have been in public life I have made, and I have attempted to cause others to make, efforts in the line of the resolution now introduced and ably advocated by my colleague. In order to arrive at any sort of contractual relations with Mexico, in view of the extreme pride of that extremely proud people, a pride that survives even amidst the most abject poverty that can be imposed upon it, we must approach the question not with denunciation, but in this body and everywhere else by making excuses, without calling to the attention of the world the frailties of our neighbor. We know we have the power to do what we please

with her; but let us see if we can not get this resolution reported and passed through the Senate, and in every step of these proceedings draw closer and closer to those who must ultimately govern that Republic for good or for evil. By that means, and by that means alone, can we hope to accomplish anything under the resolution; and I rose more for the purpose of cautioning the Senate in our deliberations concerning nations to preserve that urbanity which is supposed to exist among gentlemen.

Senators, Mexico is indebted to the United States in enormous sums of money. There is a resolution now before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which will probably be acted upon tomorrow, pressing Mexico for an adjustment of what, in round numbers, I should guess to be something like \$300,000,000 on account of damages sustained by American citizens. France and England have likewise great claims against Mexico, for which we are in a sense sponsor or guardian, in that we would not permit any aggression by any foreign power on the shores of Mexico for the purpose of seizing territory in any event for the settlement of debts. The consideration of these matters is going to cause trouble in connection with this resolution. The only way, as I have stated, by which we can ever hope to make one step forward is to commence this day in all public speeches, in all our addresses on the subject of our relations with Mexico, to pity the condition into which the ignorance of many of her people has caused her to be thrown.

Think of the German propaganda that from a time preceding this war up to this very minute has been poisoning the minds of the poor Mexicans against our Nation, and not altogether without some basis in fact. We have not treated Mexico right on the frontier, although we have done the best we could. I am not complaining of that; but I am offering it as a reason why we should act with temperance in our dealings with the Mexican people and place ourselves, if we can, in their shoes.

Think of how the Mexicans have been raised; think of the conditions under which they have attempted their self-development. The Englishman and the Frenchman were not altogether averse 10 years ago, when I was much more familiar with Mexico than I am to-day, to keeping Mexico scared to death as to the time when the great northern cloud should oversweep even her mountain tops and the strength of America find its expression in the grabbing of the Republic of Mexico. That was done for commercial and trade purposes, but it has left its impress on the heart and soul of those who would love to be friends of ours. Yet we have done nothing on earth to set aside the impression made by such propaganda. We have not had the opportunity to do so, it is true, in the last three or four years, for we have been too busy; but I do adjure Congress to take this resolution, deal with it in sympathy, and in pity where it is needed, because it has to do with a proud people, a people as brave as we are, and who hold their honor as sacred as we possibly can hold ours. Let us deal with them on the terms of perfect equality, which should exist between two contracting parties. This being carried out, I have great hope that within the next four or five or six years we may find no trouble in the world in securing that peninsula, which is absolutely invaluable to us; make that great gulf an American sea, if you please; open the Colorado River absolutely to American control, fructifying the lands that lie on the northern coast of Sonora and on the peninsula of Lower California, which will never be done, as has been so forcefully and so often said by my colleague, in the next hundred years if left under present conditions.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. President, at this time.

Mr. ASHURST. I ask that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection the resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, in accordance with the request of the Senator from Arizona.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, it is very essential that the bill authorizing the next census be passed by the Senate at the earliest possible opportunity, and in order that it may become the unfinished business, I move to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses. The fourteenth decennial census will be taken early next year. It will be an enormous task, necessitating painstaking and comprehensive preparation. I therefore make the motion in order that the bill may be before the Senate at its next meeting.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses,

which had been reported from the Committee on the Census with amendments.

Mr. SHEPPARD. In order that the Senate may have the bill before it when we next meet, I ask that the bill as reported to the Senate be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill referred to is as follows:

An act (H. R. 11984) to provide for the fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Be it enacted, etc., That a census of the population, agriculture, manufactures, forestry and forest products, and mines and quarries of the United States shall be taken by the Director of the Census in the year 1920 and every 10 years thereafter. The census herein provided for shall include each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico. A census of Guam and Samoa shall be taken in the same year by the respective governors of said islands and a census of the Panama Canal Zone by the governor of the Canal Zone in accordance with plans prescribed or approved by the Director of the Census.

SEC. 2. That the period of three years beginning the 1st day of July next preceding the census provided for in section 1 of this act shall be known as the decennial census period, and the reports upon the inquiries provided for in said section shall be completed and published within such period.

SEC. 3. That during the decennial census period, and no longer, there may be employed in the Census Office, in addition to the force provided for by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial census period, an assistant director, who shall be an experienced practical statistician; a chief statistician, who shall be a person of known and tried experience in statistical work; a disbursing clerk; an appointment clerk; a private secretary to the director; 4 stenographers; 8 expert chiefs of division; and 15 statistical experts. The assistant director shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The chief statistician, the disbursing clerk, the appointment clerk, the chiefs of divisions, and the private secretary to the director shall be appointed without examination by the Secretary of Commerce upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census. The statistical experts and the stenographers shall be appointed in conformity with the civil-service act and rules: *Provided*, That no man appointed or employed or who shall hereafter be appointed or employed under this act shall on account of such employment be certified by any official or authority for deferred classification under act No. 12, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," approved May 18, 1917, or under any act amendatory thereof that has been or shall hereafter be enacted: *Provided further*, That whenever practicable women and honorably discharged soldiers and sailors shall be employed in the positions herein provided for.

SEC. 4. That the assistant director shall perform such duties as may be prescribed by the Director of the Census. In the absence of the director, the assistant director shall serve as director, and in the absence of the director and the assistant director, the chief clerk shall serve as director.

The appointment clerk shall perform the duties assigned him by the Director of the Census. The disbursing clerk of the Census Office shall, at the beginning of the decennial census period, give bond to the Secretary of the Treasury in the sum of \$100,000, surety to be approved by the Solicitor of the Treasury, which bond shall be conditioned that the said officer shall render, quarter yearly, a true and faithful account to the proper accounting officers of the Treasury of all moneys and properties which shall be received by him by virtue of his office during the said decennial census period. Such bond shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Treasury, to be by him put in suit upon any breach of the conditions thereof.

SEC. 5. That during the decennial census period the annual compensation of the officials of the Census Office shall be as follows: The Director of the Census, [\$7,000] \$7,500; the assistant director, [\$4,500] \$5,000; three chief statisticians and the chief clerk, \$3,000 each; two [\$3,000] the chief clerk and three chief statisticians, \$4,000 each; three other chief statisticians [\$3,000] and the geographer, [\$2,750] \$3,000 each; the disbursing clerk, \$3,000; the appointment clerk, \$2,750; the chiefs of division, \$2,250 each; the private secretary to the director, \$2,250; the statistical experts, \$2,000 each; and the stenographers provided for in section three of this act, \$1,800 each.

SEC. 6. That in addition to the force hereinbefore provided for and to that authorized by the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act for the fiscal year immediately preceding the decennial census period, there may be employed in the Census Office during the decennial census period, and no longer, as many clerks [of classes four, three, two, and one] with salaries at the rates of \$1,800, \$1,680, \$1,560, \$1,440, \$1,320, \$1,200, \$1,140, \$1,080, \$1,020, \$960 and \$900; one engineer at \$1,200; and two photostat operators, at \$1,200 each; as many skilled laborers, with salaries at the rate of not less than \$720 nor more than \$1,000 per annum; and as many messengers, assistant messengers, messenger boys, watchmen, unskilled laborers, and charwomen as may be found necessary for the proper and prompt performance of the duties herein required; these additional clerks and employees to be appointed by the Director of the Census: *Provided*, That the total number of such additional clerks [of classes two, three, and four] with salaries at the rate of \$1,440 or more per annum shall at no time exceed one hundred and fifty: *Provided further*, That employees engaged in the compilation or tabulation of statistics by the use of mechanical devices may be compensated on a piece-price basis to be fixed by the director: *Provided*, That whenever possible women and honorably discharged soldiers and sailors shall be employed in the positions herein provided for.

SEC. 7. That the additional clerks and other employees provided for by section six shall be subject to such special test examinations as the Director of the Census may prescribe, [the said] subject to the approval of the United States Civil Service Commission. These examinations to be conducted by the United States Civil Service Commission, to be open to all applicants without regard to political party affiliations, and to be held at such places in each State as may be designated by the Civil Service Commission. Certifications shall be made by the Civil Service Commission upon request of the Director of the Census from the eligible registers so established, in conformity with the law of apportionment as now provided for the classified service, and selections therefrom shall be made by the Director of the Census, in the order of rating: *Provided*, That the requirement as to conformity with the law of apportionment

shall not apply to messenger boys, unskilled laborers, and charwomen: *Provided further*, That hereafter all examinations of applicants for positions in the [Census Office] Government service, from any State or Territory, shall be had in the State or Territory in which such applicant resides, and no person shall be eligible for such examination or appointment unless he or she shall have been actually domiciled in such State or Territory for at least one year previous to such examination: *Provided further*, That the Civil Service Commission [may] shall hold examination [for positions in such service] of applicants temporarily absent from the [place] places of their legal residence or domicile in the District of Columbia and elsewhere in the United States where examinations are usually held upon proof satisfactory to the commission that such [applicant is a] applicants are bona fide [resident] residents of the [State or Territory] State or Territories in which such [applicant claims to have a] applicants claim to have legal residence or domicile: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be so construed as to abridge the existing law [or] of apportionment or change the requirements of existing law as to legal residence or domicile of such applicants: *And provided further*, That no person afflicted with tuberculosis shall be appointed and that each applicant for appointment shall accompany his or her application with a certificate of health from some reputable physician [: *And provided further*, That in no instance shall more than one person be appointed from the same family]: *And provided further*, That when the exigencies of the service require, the director may appoint for temporary employment not exceeding six months' duration from the aforesaid list of eligibles those who, by reason of residence or other conditions, are immediately available; and may also appoint for not exceeding six months' duration persons having had previous experience in operating mechanical appliances in census work whose efficiency records in operating such appliances are satisfactory to him, and may accept such records in lieu of the civil-service examination: *And provided further*, That employees in other branches of the departmental classified service who have had previous experience in census work may be transferred without examination to the Census Office to serve during the whole or a part of the decennial census period, and at the end of such service the employees so transferred shall be eligible to appointment to positions in any department held by them at date of transfer to the Census Office without examination; but no employee so transferred shall within one year after such transfer receive higher salary than he is receiving at the time of the transfer: *And provided further*, That during the decennial census period and no longer the Director of the Census may fill vacancies in the permanent force of the Census Office by the promotion or transfer of clerks or other employees employed on the temporary force authorized by section six of this act: *And provided further*, That at the expiration of the decennial census period the term of service of all employees so transferred and of all other temporary officers and employees appointed under the provisions of this act shall terminate, and such officers and employees shall not be eligible to appointment or transfer into the classified service of the Government by virtue of their examination or appointment under this act.

SEC. 8. That the Fourteenth Census shall be restricted to inquiries relating to population, to agriculture, to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries. The schedules relating to population shall include for each inhabitant the name, place of abode, relationship to head of family, color, sex, age, conjugal condition, place of birth, place of birth of parents, nationality or mother tongue of all persons born in foreign countries, nationality or mother tongue of parents of foreign birth, number of years in the United States, citizenship, occupation, whether or not employer or employee, whether or not engaged in agriculture, school attendance, literacy, and tenure of home, *whether or not a survivor of any war in which the United States has been engaged, and, if so, of what war*, and the name and address of each blind or deaf and dumb person.

The schedules relating to agriculture shall include name, color, sex, and country of birth of occupant of each farm, tenure, acreage of farm, acreage of woodland, value of farm and improvements, and the encumbrance thereon, value of farm implements, number of live stock on farms, ranges, and elsewhere, and the acreage of crops and the quantities of crops and other farm products for the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration. Inquiries shall be made as to the quantity of land reclaimed by irrigation and drainage and the crops produced; also as to the location and character of irrigation and drainage enterprises, and the capital invested in such enterprises.

The schedules of inquiries relating to manufactures, to forestry and forest products, and to mines and quarries shall include the name and location of each establishment; character of organization, whether individual, corporate, or other form; character of business or kind of goods manufactured; amount of capital actually invested; number of proprietors, firm members, copartners and officers, and the amount of their salaries; number of employees and the amount of their wages; quantity and cost of materials used in manufactures; principal miscellaneous expenses; quantity and value of products; time in operation during the year; character and quantity of power used; and character and number of machines employed.

The census of manufactures, of forestry and forest products, and of mines and quarries shall relate to the year ending December 31 next preceding the enumeration of population, and shall be confined to manufacturing establishments and mines and quarries which were in active operation during all or a portion of that year. The census of manufactures shall furthermore be confined to manufacturing establishments conducted under what is known as the factory system, exclusive of the so-called neighborhood, household, and hand industries.

Whenever he shall deem it expedient, the Director of the Census may charge the collection of these statistics upon special agents or upon detailed employees, to be employed without respect to locality.

[The form and subdivision of inquiries necessary to obtain the information under the foregoing topics shall be] The number, form, and subdivision of inquiries provided for in section 8 shall be determined by the Director of the Census.

SEC. 9. That the Director of the Census shall, at least six months prior to the date fixed for commencing the enumeration at the Fourteenth and each succeeding decennial census, designate the number, whether one or more, of supervisors of census for each State, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, and shall define the districts within which they are to act; except that the Director of the Census, in his discretion, need not designate supervisors for Alaska, Hawaii, and Porto Rico, but in lieu thereof may employ special agents as hereinafter provided. The supervisors shall be appointed by the [Secretary of Commerce upon the recommendation of the Director of the Census] President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the whole number of supervisors shall not exceed 400: *Provided further*, That so far as practicable and desirable the boundaries of the supervisors' districts shall conform to the boundaries

of the congressional districts: *And provided further*, That if in any supervisor's district the supervisor has not been appointed and qualified 90 days preceding the date fixed for the commencement of the enumeration, or if any vacancy shall occur thereafter, either through death, removal, or resignation of a supervisor, or from any other cause, the Director of the Census may appoint a temporary supervisor or detail an employee of the Census Office to act as supervisor for that district.

SEC. 10. That each supervisor of census shall be charged with the performance within his own district of the following duties: To consult with the Director of Census in regard to the division of his district into subdivisions most convenient for the purpose of the enumeration, which subdivisions or enumeration districts shall be defined and the boundaries thereof fixed by the Director of the Census; to designate to the director suitable persons and with his consent to employ such persons as enumerators, one or more for each subdivision; to communicate to enumerators the necessary instructions and directions relating to their duties; to examine and scrutinize the returns of the enumerators, and in the event of discrepancies or deficiencies appearing in any of the said returns, to use all diligence in causing the same to be corrected or supplied; to forward the completed returns of the enumerators to the director at such time and in such manner as shall be prescribed, and to make up and forward to the director the accounts of each enumerator in his district for service rendered, which accounts shall be duly certified to by the enumerator, and the same shall be certified as true and correct if so found by the supervisor, and said accounts so certified shall be accepted and paid by the director. The duties imposed upon the supervisor by this act shall be performed in any and all particulars in accordance with the orders and instructions of the Director of the Census.

SEC. 11. That each supervisor of the census shall, upon the completion of his duties to the satisfaction of the Director of the Census, receive the sum of \$1,500, and in addition thereto \$1 for each thousand or major fraction of a thousand of population enumerated in his district, such sums to be in full compensation for all services rendered and expenses incurred by him: *Provided*, That of the above-named compensation a sum not to exceed \$600, in the discretion of the Director of the Census, may be paid to any supervisor prior to the completion of his duties in one or more payments, as the Director of the Census may determine: *Provided further*, That in emergencies arising in connection with the work of preparation for or during the progress of the enumeration in his district, or in connection with the remuneration of any subdivision, a supervisor may, in the discretion of the Director of the Census, be allowed actual and necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 per day during his necessary absence from his usual place of residence: *And provided further*, That an appropriate allowance to supervisors for clerk hire may be made when deemed necessary by the Director of the Census.

SEC. 12. That each enumerator shall be charged with the collection in his subdivision of the facts and statistics required by the population and agricultural schedules and such other schedules as the Director of the Census may determine shall be used by him in connection with the census, as provided in section eight of this act. It shall be the duty of each enumerator to visit personally each dwelling house in his subdivision, and each family therein, and each individual living out of a family in any place of abode, and by inquiry made of the head of each family, or of the member thereof deemed most competent and trustworthy, or of such individual living out of a family, to obtain each and every item of information and all particulars required by this act, as of date January first of the year in which the enumeration shall be made; and in case no person shall be found at the usual place of abode of such family, or individual living out of a family, competent to answer the inquiries made in compliance with the requirements of this act, then it shall be lawful for the enumerator to obtain the required information as nearly as may be practicable from the family or families or person or persons living nearest to such place of abode who may be competent to answer such inquiries. It shall be the duty also of each enumerator to forward the original schedules, properly filled out and duly certified, to the supervisor of his district as his returns under the provision of this act; and in the event of discrepancies or deficiencies being discovered in these schedules he shall use all diligence in correcting or supplying the same. In case an enumeration district embraces all or any part of any incorporated borough, village, town, or city, and also other territory not included within the limits of such incorporated borough, village, town, or city, it shall be the duty of the enumerator to clearly and plainly distinguish and separate, upon the population schedules, the inhabitants of such borough, village, town, or city from the inhabitants of the territory not included therein. No enumerator shall be deemed qualified to enter upon his duties until he has received from the supervisor of the district to which he belongs a commission, signed by the supervisor, authorizing him to perform the duties of enumerator, and setting forth the boundaries of the subdivision within which such duties are to be performed.

SEC. 13. That the territory assigned to each supervisor shall be divided into as many enumeration districts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act, and, in the discretion of the Director of the Census, two or more enumeration districts may be given to one enumerator, and the boundaries of all the enumeration districts shall be clearly described by civil divisions, rivers, roads, public surveys, or other easily distinguishable lines: *Provided*, That enumerators may be assigned for the special enumeration of institutions when desirable, without reference to the number of inmates.

SEC. 14. That any supervisor of census may, with the approval of the Director of the Census, remove any enumerator in his district and fill the vacancy thus caused or otherwise occurring. Whenever it shall appear that any portion of the census provided for in this act has been negligently or improperly taken, and is by reason thereof incomplete or erroneous, the Director of the Census may cause such incomplete and unsatisfactory enumeration and census to be amended or made anew.

SEC. 15. That the Director of the Census may authorize and direct supervisors of census to employ interpreters to assist the enumerators of their respective districts in the enumeration of persons not speaking the English language, but no authorization shall be given for such employment in any district until due and proper effort has been made to employ an enumerator who can speak the language or languages for which the services of an interpreter would otherwise be required. It shall be the duty of such interpreters to accompany the enumerator and faithfully translate the latter's inquiries and the replies thereto, but in no case shall any such interpreter perform the duties of enumerator unless commissioned as such by the Director of the Census. The compensation of such interpreters shall be fixed by the Director of the Census in advance, and shall not exceed \$5 per day for each day actually and necessarily employed.

Sec. 16. That the compensation of enumerators shall be determined by the Director of the Census as follows: In subdivisions where he shall deem such remuneration sufficient, an allowance of not less than 2 nor more than 4 cents for each inhabitant; not less than 20 nor more than 30 cents for each establishment of productive industry reported; not less than 20 nor more than 30 cents for each farm reported; not less than 20 nor more than 50 cents for each irrigation or drainage enterprise reported; and 10 cents for each barn and inclosure containing live stock not on farms. In other subdivisions the Director of the Census may fix a mixed rate of not less than \$1 nor more than \$2 per day and, in addition, an allowance of not less than 1 nor more than 3 cents for each inhabitant enumerated, and not less than 15 nor more than 20 cents for each farm and each establishment or productive industry reported. In other subdivisions per diem rates shall be fixed by the director according to the difficulty of enumeration, having special reference to the regions to be canvassed and the sparsity of settlement or other consideration pertinent thereto. The compensation allowed to an enumerator in any such district shall not be less than \$3 nor more than \$6 per day of eight hours' actual field work, and no payment shall be made for time in excess of eight hours for any one day. The subdivisions or enumeration districts to which the several rates of compensation shall apply shall be designated by the Director of the Census at least two weeks in advance of the enumeration. No claim for mileage or traveling expenses shall be allowed any enumerator in either class of subdivisions, except in extreme cases, and then only when authority has been previously granted by the Director of the Census; and the decision of the director as to the amount due any enumerator shall be final: *Provided*, That within the limits of continental United States each supervisor to be appointed or selected under this act shall be an actual resident of the district, and each enumerator to be appointed or selected under this [act] shall, so far as practicable, be an actual resident of the subdivision within which his duties are to be performed; but an enumerator may be appointed if he be an actual resident of the city, township, or other civil division of which the subdivision in which his duties are to be performed is a part.

Sec. 17. That in the event of the death of any supervisor or enumerator after his appointment and entrance on his duties, the Director of the Census is authorized to pay to the widow or legal representative of such supervisor or enumerator such sum as he may deem just and fair for the services rendered by such supervisor or enumerator.

Sec. 18. That special agents may be appointed by the Director of the Census to carry out the provisions of this act and of the act to provide for a permanent Census Office, approved March 6, 1902, and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto; and such special agents shall perform such duties in connection with the enforcement of said acts as may be required of them by the Director of the Census. The special agents thus appointed shall receive compensation at rates to be fixed by the Director of the Census, such compensation, however, not to exceed \$6 per diem except as hereinafter provided: *Provided*, That during the decennial census period the Director of the Census may fix the compensation of not to exceed 25 special agents, who shall be persons of known and tried experience in statistical work, at an amount not to exceed \$10 per diem: *Provided further*, That the Director of the Census may, in his discretion, fix the compensation of special agents on a piece-price basis without limitation as to the amount earned per diem: *And provided further*, That the special agents appointed under this section shall be entitled to necessary traveling expenses and an allowance in lieu of subsistence not to exceed \$4 per diem during necessary absence from their usual places of residence; but no pay or allowance in lieu of subsistence shall be allowed special agents when employed in the Census Office on other than the special work committed to them, and no appointments of special agents shall be made for clerical work: *And provided further*, That the Director of the Census shall have power, and is hereby authorized, to appoint special agents to assist the supervisors whenever he may deem it proper, in connection with the work of preparation for, or during the progress of, the enumeration or in connection with the reenumeration of any district or a part thereof; or he may, in his discretion, employ for this purpose any of the permanent or temporary employees of the Census Office; and the special agents and employees of the Census Office so appointed or employed shall perform such duties in connection with the enforcement of this act as may be required of them by the Director of the Census or by the supervisors of the districts to which they are assigned, and when engaged in the work of enumeration or reenumeration shall have like authority with and perform the same duties as the enumerators in respect to the subjects committed to them under this act.

Sec. 19. That every supervisor, supervisor's clerk, enumerator, interpreter, special agent, or other employee shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation, to be prescribed by the Director of the Census. All appointees and employees provided for in this act shall be appointed or employed and examined, if examination is required by this act, solely with reference to their fitness to perform the duties required of them by the provisions of this act and without reference to their political party affiliations.

Sec. 20. That the enumeration of the population required by section 1 of this act shall be taken as of the 1st day of January, and it shall be the duty of each enumerator to commence the enumeration of his district on the day following, unless the Director of the Census, in his discretion, shall defer the enumeration in said district by reason of climatic or other conditions which would materially interfere with the proper conduct of the work; but in any event it shall be the duty of each enumerator to prepare the returns hereinbefore required to be made and to forward the same to the supervisor of his district within 30 days from the commencement of the enumeration of his district: *Provided*, That in any city having [5,000] 2,500 inhabitants or more under the preceding census the enumeration of the population shall be completed within two weeks from the commencement thereof.

Sec. 21. That if any person shall receive or secure to himself any fee, reward, or compensation as a consideration for the appointment or employment of any person as supervisor, enumerator, or clerk, or other employee, or shall in any way receive or secure to himself any part of the compensation paid to any supervisor, enumerator, or clerk, or other employee, he shall be deemed guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than \$3,000 and be imprisoned not more than five years.

Sec. 22. That any supervisor, supervisor's clerk, enumerator, interpreter, special agent, or other employee who, having taken and subscribed the oath of office required by this act, shall, without justifiable cause, neglect or refuse to perform the duties enjoined on him by this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$500; or if he shall, without the authority of the Director of the Census, publish or communicate any information coming into his possession by reason of his employment under the provisions of this act, or the act to provide for a permanent

Census Office or acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, he shall be guilty of a felony and shall upon conviction thereof be fined not to exceed \$1,000 or be imprisoned not to exceed two years, or both so fined and imprisoned, in the discretion of the court; or if he shall willfully and knowingly swear or affirm falsely as to the truth of any statement required to be made or subscribed by him under oath by or under authority of this act or of the act to provide for a permanent Census Office or acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, he shall be deemed guilty of perjury, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$2,000 or imprisoned not exceeding five years, or both; or if he shall willfully and knowingly make a false certificate or a fictitious return he shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction of either of the last-named offenses he shall be fined not exceeding \$2,000 or be imprisoned not exceeding five years, or both; or if any person who is or has been an enumerator shall knowingly or willfully furnish or cause to be furnished, directly or indirectly, to the Director of the Census or to any supervisor of the census any false statement or false information with reference to any inquiry for which he was authorized and required to collect information he shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$2,000 or be imprisoned not exceeding five years, or both.

Sec. 23. That it shall be the duty of all persons over 18 years of age when requested by the Director of the Census, or by any supervisor, enumerator, or special agent, or other employee of the Census Office, acting under the instructions of the said director, to answer correctly, to the best of their knowledge, all questions on the census schedules applying to themselves and to the families to which they belong or are related, and to the farm or farms of which they or their families are the occupants; and any person over 18 years of age who, under the conditions hereinbefore stated, shall refuse or willfully neglect to answer any of these questions, or shall willfully give answers that are false, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$100.

And it is hereby made unlawful for any individual, committee, or other organization of any kind whatsoever to offer or render to any supervisor, supervisor's clerk, enumerator, interpreter, special agent, or other officer or employee of the Census Office engaged in making an enumeration of population, either directly or indirectly, any suggestion, advice, or assistance of any kind, with the intent or purpose of causing an inaccurate enumeration of population to be made, either as to the number of persons resident in any district or community, or in any other respect; and any individual, or any officer or member of any committee or other organization of any kind whatsoever, who directly or indirectly offers or renders any such suggestion, advice, information, or assistance, with such unlawful intent or purpose, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$5,000.

And it shall be the duty of every owner, proprietor, manager, superintendent, or agent of a hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building, when requested by the Director of the Census, or by any supervisor, enumerator, special agent, or other employee of the census office, acting under the instructions of the said director to furnish the names of the occupants of said hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building, and to give thereto free ingress and egress to any duly accredited representative of the census office, so as to permit of the collection of statistics for census purposes, including the proper and correct enumeration of all persons having their usual place of abode in said hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building; and any owner, proprietor, manager, superintendent, or agent of a hotel, apartment house, boarding or lodging house, tenement, or other building who shall refuse or willfully neglect to give such information or assistance under the conditions hereinbefore stated shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$500.

Sec. 24. That it shall be the duty of every owner, official, agent, person in charge, or assistant to the person in charge, of any company, business, institution, establishment, religious body, or organization of any nature whatsoever, to answer completely and correctly to the best of his knowledge all questions relating to his respective company, business, institution, establishment, religious body, or other organization, or to records or statistics in his official custody, contained on any census schedule prepared by the Director of the Census under the authority of this act, or of the act to provide for a permanent census office, approved March 6, 1902, or of acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto; and any person violating the provisions of this section by refusing or willfully neglecting to answer any of said questions, or by willfully giving answers that are false, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not exceeding \$10,000, or imprisoned for a period not exceeding one year, or both so fined and imprisoned.

The provisions of this section shall also apply to the collection of the information required and authorized by the act entitled "An act to provide for a permanent census office," and by acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto.

Sec. 25. That the information furnished under the provisions of the next preceding section shall be used only for the statistical purposes for which it is supplied. No publication shall be made by the census office whereby the data furnished by any particular establishment can be identified, nor shall the Director of the Census permit anyone other than the sworn employees of the census office to examine the individual reports.

Sec. 26. That all fines and penalties imposed by this act may be enforced by indictment or information in any court of competent jurisdiction.

Sec. 27. That the Director of the Census may authorize the expenditure of necessary sums for the actual and necessary traveling expenses of the officers and employees of the census office, including an allowance in lieu of subsistence not exceeding \$4 per day during their necessary absence from the census office, or, instead of such an allowance, their actual subsistence expenses, not to exceed \$5 per day; and he may authorize the incidental, miscellaneous, and contingent expenses necessary for the carrying out of this act, as herein provided, and not otherwise, including advertising in newspapers, the purchase of manuscripts, books of reference, and periodicals, the rental of sufficient quarters in the District of Columbia and elsewhere and the furnishing thereof, and expenditures necessary for compiling, printing, publishing, and distributing the results of the census, the purchase of necessary paper and other supplies, the purchase, rental, exchange, construction, and repair of mechanical appliances, the compensation of such permanent and temporary clerks as may be employed under the provisions of this act and the act establishing the permanent census office and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and all other expenses incurred under authority conveyed in this act.

Sec. 28. That the Director of the Census is hereby authorized to make requisition upon the Public Printer for such printing as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, to wit: Blanks, schedules, circulars, pamphlets, envelopes, work sheets, and other items

of miscellaneous printing; that he is further authorized to have printed by the Public Printer, in such editions as the director may deem necessary, preliminary and other census bulletins, and final reports of the results of the several investigations authorized by this act or by the act to establish a permanent Census Office and acts amendatory thereof or supplemental thereto, and to publish and distribute said bulletins and reports.

SEC. 29. That all mail matter, of whatever class or weight, relating to the census and addressed to the Census Office, or to any official thereof, and indorsed "Official business, Census Office," shall be transmitted free of postage, and by registered mail if necessary, and so marked: *Provided*, That if any person shall make use of such indorsement to avoid the payment of postage or registry fee on his or her private letter, package, or other matter in the mail, the person so offending shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and subject to a fine of \$300, to be prosecuted in any court of competent jurisdiction.

SEC. 30. That the Secretary of Commerce, whenever he may deem it advisable, on request of the Director of the Census, is hereby authorized to call upon any other department or office of the Government for information pertinent to the work herein provided for.

SEC. 31. That there shall be in the year 1925, and once every 10 years thereafter, a census of agriculture and live stock, which shall show the acreage of farm land, the acreage of the principal crops, and the number and value of the domestic animals on the farms and ranges of the country. The schedule employed in this census shall be prepared by the Director of the Census. Such census shall be taken as of the 1st day of January and shall relate to the preceding calendar year. The Director of the Census may appoint enumerators or special agents for the purpose of this census in accordance with the provisions of the permanent census act.

SEC. 32. That the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to collect and publish, for the years, 1921, 1923, 1925, and 1927, and for every tenth year after each of said years, statistics of the products of manufacturing industries; and the director is hereby authorized to prepare such schedules as in his judgment may be necessary.

SEC. 33. That the Director of the Census be, and he is hereby, authorized, at his discretion, upon the written request of the governor of any State or Territory or of a court of record, to furnish such governor or court of record with certified copies of so much of the population or agricultural returns as may be requested, upon the payment of the actual cost of making such copies and \$1 additional for certification; and that the Director of the Census is further authorized, in his discretion, to furnish to individuals such data from the population schedules as may be desired for genealogical or other proper purposes, upon payment of the actual cost of searching the records and \$1 for supplying a certificate; and that the Director of the Census is authorized to furnish transcripts of tables and other records and to prepare special statistical compilations for State or local officials, private concerns, or individuals upon the payment of the actual cost of such work: *Provided, however, That in no case shall information furnished under the authority of this act be used to the detriment of the person or persons to whom such information relates.* All moneys hereafter received by the Bureau of the Census in payment for labor and materials used in furnishing transcripts of census records or special statistical compilations from such records shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for collecting statistics.

SEC. 34. That the act establishing the permanent Census Office, approved March 6, 1902, and acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, except as are herein amended, shall remain in full force. That the act entitled "An act to provide for the thirteenth and subsequent decennial censuses," approved July 2, 1909, and acts amendatory thereof, and all other laws and parts of laws inconsistent with the provisions of this act, are hereby repealed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AFFAIRS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the armed forces of the United States landed in Russia some months ago under the orders of the Commander in Chief are—if the press dispatches can be relied upon at all—engaged at the present time in making war upon Russia.

Some of the troops employed in the military operations there are from my own State, and I ask to be officially informed as to the presence of our troops in Russia, and I think the Congress and the country ought to know why we are making war upon the Russian people.

On the 2d of this month there appeared in the New York Times a dispatch stating that soldiers from Wisconsin and from an adjoining State were at the time engaged in desperate military operations in Russia and against Russian troops. The item, which is in the form of a "delayed dispatch," I send to the Secretary's desk and ask to have read down to the point I have indicated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

[From the New York Times, Jan. 2, 1919.]

ALLIES IN RUSSIA DRIVE BACK REDS—AMERICANS TAKE BRILLIANT PART IN ATTACK ON FRONT SOUTH OF ARCHANGEL—IN CAMOUFLAGE FLANK FOR—WINTER QUARTERS WON BY ADVANCE—ALLIES GAIN ON THE ONEGA AND DVINA.

AMERICAN HEADQUARTERS IN NORTHERN RUSSIA.

December 30. (Delayed.)

Fighting their way through the untracked forest and deep snow, American soldiers of the 339th Regiment, with the Polish Legion, Russian volunteers, and their French allies, have advanced 15 miles up the Onega River on the extreme west of the Archangel sector, driving the Bolsheviks before them. A score of tiny native log-hut villages have fallen, and to-night, with a snowstorm raging, the men are held up by overwhelming numbers of Bolsheviks.

Some 75 miles east of this Onega fighting the American troops, supported by Canadian artillery, have captured the town of Kadish, and established lines one-half mile south.

These two victories comprise a tremendous improvement of the allied outpost positions, which, stretching like ribs, run over a 400-mile front, with Archangel as a hub.

It is impossible to conceive of a stranger, more picturesque, or more romantic bit of action than these two advances. No sun shines these winter days, and it is only light for four or five hours at the most. On all sides stretch the endless, dreary, depressing forests of fir, cut only by a few trails and frozen rivers. Little native villages dot these river banks, and in the log huts the simple, peaceful peasants hibernate during the long winter months.

To-night on this Onega River, 40 miles west of the Vologda-Archangel Railroad, 20 of these villages are in the hands of the allies. With this gain and prize there will probably be no more advances attempted for some time.

The heavy, gray Russian dawn had just broken at 9 o'clock when the artillery began the preliminary bombardment against the Bolshevik position. Only with the greatest difficulty had the guns been dragged across the snows, but it had been done, and this morning the French artillery opened what may be the last advance in which American troops will ever take part.

After a few minutes of heavy shelling the allies left the blockhouses and advanced up the river roads straight at the enemy positions. Already flanking parties, drawing hand sleds loaded with ammunition and rations, had made their way through the forest and were attacking the rear. Every man was clothed in a heavy Arctic outfit and wore a white canvas robe with a cowl that in the faint light even of midday made him indistinguishable at a few hundred yards.

At 4 o'clock in the morning these gallant flanking parties had cut into the woods on the great adventure. In snow knee deep, with the temperature at zero, they were starting for unknown parts, across uncharted woods, on a desperate charge. It was really romantic.

Stunned by the surprise attack from the front, the Bolsheviks fell back from their advance positions. Immediately their rear was endangered by the flanking parties, so they were forced to withdraw several miles. Here in a log-hut village they made a determined stand, utilizing the strongly built native houses with small windows and heavy doors as blockhouses. There was heavy fighting here, and again and again the Americans and their allies charged these improvised blockhouses. Steadily the Bolsheviks were forced back, fighting desperately in each little village as they took up retreating positions.

Finally late in the afternoon, when the twilight had settled down, they stiffened their defense, and 15 miles from the old positions they stopped the sweeping advance of the allies. The Bolsheviks suffered considerable casualties and some prisoners. Our losses were comparatively small.

Seventy-five miles east, on the other side of the railroad, the American soldiers with Canadian artillery fought to-day another gallant battle. Some 10 weeks ago the allies had been forced back by superior numbers from the little village of Kadish, and had taken up a position on the Emtsa River, 2 miles to the north. Here in the forest they built tiny blockhouses, lean-tos, and shelters, and camped in the ice and snow. To reach them there was a two-day sled trip from the railroad, and the only road from there on to the next allied position eastward was a tedious, dangerous, roundabout trail.

In Kadish village there were warm log houses, and running at right angles from the town was a straight road leading direct to the next allied outpost. To-night this village, with its comfortable billets and valuable road, is in the hands of the Americans, while our forward positions are a mile and a half beyond.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall not take the time of the Senate to comment at length upon the disclosures made in that dispatch. It is said further:

Five hundred Wisconsin and Michigan men, struggling gamely through the heavy snow, carrying rifles, ammunition, machine guns, and extra rations, did the job of flanking the Bolsheviks and surprising them much the same as their British pals did the trick 75 miles to the west.

I do not know how other Senators may feel, but I should be false to my conception of duty to my State and to her people if I did not exhaust every means in my power to find out by what right hundreds of young men of Wisconsin are engaged in conducting a war on Russia.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. KENYON. I should like to ask the Senator if he knows what has become of the resolution proposed by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] to find out why our troops are in Russia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood that it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. Not being a member of that committee, I do not know what consideration it is receiving at the hands of the committee.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do. The Senator from Virginia is a member of the committee.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] expected to have made a speech or a statement to-day in reference to the Russian situation. To-morrow the committee anticipated taking up that matter for consideration, and expected to hear the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Polk, regarding the Russian situation. On account of some Senators who are members of that committee attending the funeral of Col. Roosevelt, the meeting of the committee, as I understand, has been deferred. There is no disposition in the committee to shirk any

information that it is proper to give nor to shirk giving the resolution consideration.

As the Senator from Wisconsin has asked why our soldiers are at Archangel, I think possibly I can give him the information.

As soon as the North Sea was mined, and also the English Channel, it was nearly impossible for German submarines to get out into the ocean. When there was a collapse in Russia—and it was quite a collapse—and the Russian forces had surrendered to the Germans, and the Government there was thought to be more or less in alliance with the German Government, the next place where Germany sought to have a submarine base was at Archangel. It was possibly the only place available for a submarine base, from which submarines could go out and prey upon the commerce of the allies and also their ships. There was quite a discussion as to what should be done to take care of Archangel and the large supplies the allies had there. The Germans were endeavoring to get through Finland, the existing Government of which was friendly; and there is an impression, which I think is justified, that the Bolshevik Government was friendly to Germany. If the Germans had been able to take Archangel, had been able to establish a submarine base there, and could have operated their submarines from there, it would have been a greater menace than was possible anywhere else for the use of the submarines as an efficient naval arm.

In order to prevent this, and to take care of the vast supplies that were already landed there that the Germans were trying to get, as I understand—not speaking authoritatively but from information that I have in a more or less general way—the allies reached a conclusion as to what they should do to prevent this menace; and I think the United States sent about 2,500 men to unite with the allies to hold Archangel. That was, first, to take care of the vast supplies there; second, to prevent the great menace of a submarine base there, which would have been very disastrous to the allies if Archangel had been captured and used for that purpose.

I think the allies have from fifteen to twenty thousand men there, with about twenty-five hundred United States troops. I am not speaking authoritatively, but simply from general information. There was no intention, as I understand, to go farther than to hold Archangel and the country surrounding there, so as to make it safe for the allies, and so that the German menace could not be continued by capturing that as a submarine base.

Archangel was thus held, and the surrounding country out far enough to make it safe. In occupying this place we acquired obligations to many citizens of Russia who united with and aided us. To leave immediately, and to give up Archangel until some terms of peace have been made, would be to let these Russian friends of ours be massacred, murdered. It would be cowardly desertion. In addition to that, we would lose the supplies.

That, as I understand, is the present situation at Archangel. I know, as the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, that there was great apprehension that Archangel would be captured and used as a base for submarines by Germany.

As to what is the ultimate purpose, when these troops should be withdrawn, I am not prepared to say. I am not prepared to say what the conditions are or to what extent the government in Russia might be in alliance with Germany, or what the future conditions might be. All I can say is that if war should arise in the future, if Archangel should be in the hands of anybody adverse to this country or the allies, it would be a very serious situation.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I have listened to the explanation made by the Senator from Virginia, who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations; and while it does "explain" the sending of the troops to Russia, it does not set forth what I think at the time was commonly understood to be the reason why they were sent in. Mr. President, with regard to the observation of the Senator, that it was supposed that the revolutionary—the soviet—government of Russia was friendly to, supporting, and in sympathy with Germany, I wish to say that the information which has come to me, and of the reliability of which I have no doubt, because I know personally some of the people who have been in and who brought the information out of Russia, is contrary to the view expressed by the Senator. I think, before anyone assumes to arrive at a conclusion upon that subject, all the information obtainable in this country should be carefully considered.

A mass of information came out of Russia last May. Some Senators had an opportunity to see and examine it, or at least to hear a statement with regard to it. At that time, Mr. President, it was my privilege to see original documents by which

the reliability of that evidence was attested, not only by the representatives of our Government in Russia, but by the representatives in Russia of other Governments with whom we were cooperating. I think, sir, that the proof is overwhelming that the soviet government from the beginning exerted itself in every possible way to enlist the sympathy and support of the Government of the United States, to the end that it might be strong enough to resist the German Government.

Mr. President, I did not expect to go into that matter at all, or to touch upon this question in any way, excepting to present my inquiry.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield further?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Pardon me just one moment. Let me say this, further:

Whatever comes to the American people through the censored channels of the press regarding the soviet government of Russia ought to be subjected to pretty careful scrutiny before it is accepted as stating the whole truth. The great organized wealth of all the established governments of the world at this time fears above all things on earth the principles attempted to be established by the soviet government of Russia. So long as the news channels are censored it is not to be expected that there shall be permitted to reach the ears of the masses of the people of the world anything approaching the truth with respect to that government or what is taking place in Russia at this time.

I think the Senate was fortunate this afternoon in having presented to it the able address of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHBURST] with reference to the purchase of Lower California. It was not my privilege to hear all of that address, but I inquired about one feature of it from another Senator, because I did not wish to interrupt unnecessarily touching any matter upon which the Senator had spoken. I understand that he started with the proposition that before negotiations should be opened whereby this Government should reach out and acquire Lower California the people who live there were to be consulted, and their wishes were to be controlling in the matter; that peoples are not to be bought and sold because governments have power; that little nations ought to have their rights respected; that any government in the world that suits the people of a country, whether it suits the people of neighboring nations or not, ought to be as much the care of the powerful nations of the world as their own interests. And so I say of this soviet government, of which we know so little, if it is the sort of government that one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty million people of Russia want, that is their business and not ours, nor the business of any other government on earth, and, whatever the pretext, no government should intrude itself into their affairs.

Disorder and bloodshed have accompanied every revolution of history. We ourselves passed through a period that one of the great historians has devoted a chapter to, entitled "Anarchy." From the day of the fall of the Bastille, France was drenched in blood. The bloodier a revolution the stronger the evidence that there has preceded it oppression unspeakable. The law of action and reaction is the same, not only in physics but in the affairs of men.

Although at the time I was in possession of what I believe to be reliable facts in the critical juncture to which the Senator from Virginia has referred, I would not, when the war was on, raise any question here or elsewhere concerning the presence of troops in Russia; and yet, under the recognized rules of international law the question might well have been raised. Russia at that time had withdrawn from the war. Other nations at war, for their own advantage, under international law, had no right to take possession of Russian territory, occupy it, and make it a base of operations; but everybody, in the presence of the awful catastrophe which had come upon the world, felt that at that stage matters should take their course.

But, Mr. President, the war is ended. There can be no pretext that the troops of the United States on Russian soil to-day are fighting anybody but the Russian people. Under what rules of international law, tell me, can the military forces of the United States engage in killing in Russia without our Government being held to indemnify the Government of Russia and the people of Russia? This nation and our troops are protected there by no declaration of war. There have been no grounds presented to this Congress, and I venture to say that no grounds can be presented, upon which a declaration of war could be predicated against the Russian people and the de facto Russian Government. But battles are fought, American blood is shed, Russians are killed on Russian soil. Evidently, from the dis-

patch which I have presented to the Senate, and a later one, which appeared in the morning papers yesterday, desperate fighting is going on there continually. If we have any more lawful right to maintain an army for aggressive warfare—for such is the character of the operation shown by these dispatches—in Russia than we have in China or Japan or any other country, I am most anxious to hear our right in that respect stated and defined, not in general terms, not in phrases that relate to something that occurred or is supposed to have occurred many months ago, when we were at war with Germany, and about which there never has been a syllable of proof furnished excepting the "Sisson papers," over which the slime of chicanery and falsification and fraud and forgery is plainly manifest.

When my constituents appeal to me, as they do daily, to explain why their boys, having entered the service of their country to fight the declared enemy of their country, are retained in remote parts of the earth to wage a war not against the common enemy, but against a people with whom we are at peace, I have no answer.

But, sir, those citizens of Wisconsin and of every other State who are asking that question have made the supremest sacrifice for their country, and they are entitled to an answer. I am aware, Mr. President, that these are troublous times. We should proceed with caution and with no more precipitation than the terrible exigencies of the situation require, but in my judgment the time has come when an explanation is due from the administration concerning its purpose in keeping our soldiers in Russia. It is due that we should know by what right they are there and for what purpose they are engaged in prosecuting war.

It is necessary also that the explanation should be couched in plain and direct language so we can understand what it means. If this dispatch which I have read is true, and a number like it have appeared in the press recently, we are to-day making war upon Russia. Are we going to continue to make war upon her or are we not? The people are entitled to have that question answered and have it answered now.

It is no answer to say that the Government of Russia at the present time is unstable or that it is corrupt or that it is unjust. That we do not like the government of a country is no reason for making war upon it. There is no reason at this time for us either to support or oppose the present soviet government of Russia. It may be as bad as its enemies claim or as idealistic as its friends declare. That has nothing to do with the question.

Why should we either condemn or defend the Russian form of government? In the first place we know next to nothing about it, and we are not likely to know much about it while the present censorship continues. We do know, however, from our knowledge of the Russian people gained long before the present war that they are a great, idealistic, hard-working, and liberty-loving people who struggled for many years against one of the worst and most tyrannous governments that ever cursed any country. Yet, sir, these are the people that, so far as we can judge, have organized and are upholding by a great majority the present soviet government. These facts respecting the Russian people should make anyone hesitate to believe the fantastic tales respecting the present Government of Russia.

But aside from all that, whether the Russian Government is good or bad according to our standards it is not for us to attempt to overthrow it. We have enough to do at present right here in the United States and are likely to have for some time to come in making living conditions more tolerable and in restoring peace and prosperity and self-government to our own people. The first step in that process is to withdraw our soldiers from Russia or explain their presence there to the satisfaction of the people of this country.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I do not purpose to make any address regarding the Russian Government, but I wish to call the attention of the Senate to this fact:

If the Russian Government had been friendly to the allies, as has been suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin, I am at a loss to understand why they were unwilling for the allies to have troops at Archangel to prevent that place from being a base for German submarines. The very fact that they antagonized the allies occupying Archangel to prevent it from being held as a base for German submarines to prey upon American commerce, to destroy and sink American transports carrying American boys to fight for liberty in Europe, is conclusive proof that they were unfriendly to the allies.

The Senator implies that they were unable to protect themselves from Germany. Concede that that is true, that they were powerless to protect themselves from German inroads, German invasion, and German power; the allies went to Archangel and put troops there which made it impossible for Germany to oc-

cupy and take that place as a base for German submarines. It was known at that time that the German Army was trying to get through Finland. Its fleet was in the Baltic. It had supremacy in the Baltic. Its effort was to break through and get to Archangel, and use it as a base for German submarines. The North Sea had been mined. It became almost impossible to get submarines through there. The English Channel was mined. There was only one place where they could operate against American ships, American transports, American commerce, and destroy the allies as far as submarine warfare could do it, and that was at Archangel.

If the suggestion of the Senator is right, it was the duty of the allies then to wait, to be indifferent, to allow Germany to take charge of Archangel, to make twice as efficient and effective this warfare with the submarines. Why, America would have been recreant to its duty, the President would have been recreant to his duty as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, if he had sat silent and not united with the allies to prevent this great advantage coming to Germany.

That made submarine warfare almost impossible when it was impossible for Germany to get through to Archangel. Unless a person is desirous of letting the allies be powerless in preventing submarine warfare, he should not antagonize the allies taking advantage of the situation and possessing themselves of Archangel.

It would have been a serious mistake; there is no telling what the effect on the submarine warfare during this entire time would have been if Germany could have possessed this base for submarine warfare purposes. There is no telling how many transports carrying American troops would have been sunk by German submarines. No one could tell what was occurring or what would occur in Russia.

Mr. KENYON. That danger is all past now, is it not; and why do we not take the boys out of Russia?

Mr. SWANSON. That brings up the second proposition. As I understand, the troops of the allies which they have in Russia are not sufficient in number to make any offense, except as I understand the offensive has been for their own protection. I might be mistaken about that. I have not looked into it thoroughly, but the general impression I have had is that they only occupied territory around Archangel to a sufficient extent to make it safe and to hold it as such, and that the offensive has been on the part of the Bolshevik government.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator why do we want to hold Archangel?

Mr. SWANSON. The war is not over.

Mr. THOMAS. If the Senator will permit me, I want to suggest that there are enormous stores of ammunition and supplies belonging to the allies at Archangel, if my information is correct, and the transportation needed for its removal is not available. They must either protect this property or lose it. They can not very well afford to lose it. I think the fact of the existence of these supplies—and they are there in enormous quantities—is one of the best reasons for remaining there until the property of the allies can be transferred.

Mr. NORRIS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SWANSON. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. Has the Senator any information as to how long we expect to hold that as a base of supplies? Why do we want to keep supplies there now?

Mr. SWANSON. As the Senator from Colorado has said, and as I said in response to the Senator from Wisconsin, we went there for two purposes; to prevent it from being used as a submarine base and because there were large supplies there. We are there, the war is not over; nobody can tell what the conditions in Russia for the future are; there has been no effort, except so far as the Bolsheviks has compelled it, to have offensive warfare, I think. As I understand, the Bolsheviks have been the offensive people. They have been the people that have been trying to drive the American and allied troops from Archangel. I am satisfied that if they would be quiet the allies would be quiet there. I have no authority for saying so, but that is the general impression that I have. The forces there are not sufficiently large for offensive warfare in Russia. The port of Vladivostok and this port of Archangel are the two most important ports and were in considerable danger at the time of the Russian collapse. Germany was trying to get both. We would have been recreant to our duty, recreant to our obligations, if we permitted these vast supplies at these two ports to fall into the hands of Germany, and in addition to that to permit this port of Archangel to be used as a submarine base. It has only been since the 11th of November that the armistice has been signed. Peace has not been made. No one knows now what is the attitude of the Russian Government toward the United States. I notice that a Russian representative or minister to Berlin made

a speech the other night, if the reports in the newspapers are true, in which he stated that the Bolshevik government of Russia should unite with a similar government of Germany to wage warfare against the Anglo-Saxon allies. If that is the purpose, common sense and common patriotism demand that Archangel should be held until we ascertain whether that is true or not. Then, as the Senator so well said, do the Senators here advocate that the troops shall be withdrawn at once and that all these supplies should be surrendered? Are these troops to be brought out sooner than any other troops when it is just as urgent a necessity that they shall be there as elsewhere?

I am satisfied from the number of troops there and from the number of troops in Siberia that it is a matter of defensive and not of offensive warfare against the Russian Government. We sent, I think, about seven or nine thousand troops to Siberia. Twenty-five hundred, I think, is the number of troops furnished at Archangel. I understand Japanese troops are now being withdrawn from Siberia, which is proof that there is no intention of offensive warfare, certainly at the present.

I can remember that Senators and other people in this country were criticizing President Wilson because he did not send a great army to Russia, because he did not send millions of men there to create an eastern line. I remember the criticism was severe, but in this, as in other matters, President Wilson has justified his statesmanship and justified his wisdom. He took the position that the right place to wage the war was on the western line, and not to try to create an eastern line by marching through Russia; that the efforts would be more effective if spent on the western line. That policy has been vindicated, although the subject of criticism at the time. The position he took was to hold these two places, and it seems to me they should be held until this war is settled. If the Bolshevik government tries to get these supplies, tries to massacre American troops sent over for that purpose, our troops have the right to exercise the privilege of self-defense. I think the Government was right in sending these troops there.

As to what the future purposes are, I am not authorized to speak authoritatively. The Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Polk, will be before the committee. What I mean is that I am satisfied that the American Government having pledged itself to the 14 points raised by President Wilson, which give self-determination to nations, justice and right to all, for which he is battling now and has battled, that this constitutes an assurance that the American troops will be kept nowhere except to carry out the purposes of justice and defend ourselves in the war that I voted for and believe was just. Indeed it was just because civilization was involved, just because American rights were jeopardized, just because American honor was assaulted on the high seas. The very high principles that President Wilson promulgated in Europe ought to be sufficient guaranty to these critics that American troops are sent nowhere except to act for justice, to carry out what he says in his great messages and in his great addresses should be the basis upon which peace should be made in the world.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I do not rise to criticize the Government in its attitude or policy in connection with this matter. I am not making any contention about any right of any Russian government. I do not question the purpose of this Government in maintaining an army in Russia at this time. But there is one thing I do want to say. The fighting has stopped in France, the fighting has stopped in Germany, but the fighting is in full force in Russia, and the American troops are engaged. We have found it necessary to send these troops there. They are Americans, and they are hopelessly outnumbered, dragging themselves through the snow yonder and fighting a foe overwhelming in numbers. If we have found it necessary to send American troops to Russia, and if our purposes require that they shall be maintained there, then we must support them with an army sufficient to take care of itself in Russia or anywhere else. When I read yesterday morning the account in the papers of American troops being so hopelessly outnumbered and how they were crawling on their hands through the snow and staining it with good American blood, I thought our Government ought to support them and ought to do it now and ought to do it with a force that is sufficient to take care of itself there or anywhere else.

If it is necessary to maintain an army in Russia, we owe it to the army already on the ground to send others there who will maintain this army and protect them and our rights, or we should withdraw the little handful that is there before they are absolutely destroyed.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I think every Senator has received many letters on the Russian situation. I am not rising especially for the purpose of criticism, but I am rising rather to read into the Record extracts from a letter of one of the

mothers of these boys in Russia. I thoroughly agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY]. We have a little force in Russia that will be wiped out by the murderous Bolsheviks. Let us bring them back, or if we are going to do the things that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] says, and if these things are necessary, let us put an army there and do it, and not allow our men to be wiped out by these murderous people. I see no reason why these men should remain in Russia. If they must, let us support them properly; that is the point I want to emphasize.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will permit me, I understand while we have only 2,500 men the allies have about 15,000, and these were thought sufficient at that time, and are thought so now, for defensive purposes and the holding of Archangel. I do not know and can not state authoritatively that they are outnumbered.

Mr. KENYON. The people of the country are going to get information as to why our troops are in Russia, and the Senate is not going to permit any burial in any committee of a resolution asking for that information.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. KENYON. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should like to ask the Senator a question, which I was tempted to ask the Senator from Arkansas when he was speaking, both of them taking the view that we should at once send a large army into Russia.

Mr. KENYON. Or withdraw the troops we have there.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does it not occur to the Senator from Iowa that it would be a pretty wise thing for us to make a declaration of war before we go any further with this business?

Mr. KENYON. Yes; that is true; but the Senator does not get my viewpoint. I do not say a large army. I say we should do one of two things—withdraw these men, or, if they are to be kept there for any purpose, put a sufficient Army there to keep them from slaughter. That is the point I make. I say, however, withdraw them. We are not at war with Russia. Now that peace is in sight, are we to begin all over again with a new war? I say no.

The mothers of the boys who are in Russia are going to be heard. While the letter which I have is rather sarcastic in some places, it is from a woman in my State who has done wonderful work in the Red Cross, who is chairman of the county organization of the Red Cross in her county, who has one boy wounded on the battle fields of France and now in a hospital there, and this other boy of hers, her only remaining boy, is fighting through the snows of Russia, without any authority to put him there that anybody knows of. I have tried to get information from the War Department about this boy. I can not get a word. The cables are so burdened with other important matters just now, even to descriptions of gowns and hats worn at some of the ostentatious displays going on across the sea, that these mothers can not find out about their boys. They have some right to be heard in the Senate, and they are going to be heard in the country. I will not read all of this letter, but here is part of it:

I trust you will pardon my troubling you again so soon, but I, at least, had the great pleasure of a response, which so far has been denied me by Secretary of War Baker. Perhaps he thinks he has something bigger than mothers' letters to think of, and, no doubt, he is a busy man; but if it were not for we mothers of men he might be under German rule to-day, and we resent silence when all is at stake for us. I wrote Secretary of War and sent him the picture of this dear boy that we are now so concerned about some days before I wrote you. But not one word from Baker. I did not ask anything unreasonable, only what protection did that little handful of men have against those millions, as every paper we pick up some one is protesting that our Army is left there under such dangerous conditions to eat black, sour bread. If it is wise to leave them, why not give them such care as United States gives to our soldiers? My son has not made one complaint of anything, and he does not know I am writing or so worried. Baker tells us to write cheerful letters to our boys. This boy was three months before he heard from home, and we have been that long trying to get a cable through. I gave my boys gladly, and I would not have them out of it one hour too soon, but I feel it is not just for us to be kept in ignorance when we know conditions to be the worst.

England will not send their men—

That, of course, is a mistake, for wherever there has been the call in any part of the world Britain has responded with her men—

Why should ours be left there to be slaughtered? I'd like to send Mr. Baker or his boys (if he has any), perhaps then he would begin to think something better be done. And while he is waiting to decide, what of our boys?

I thought there was only one place worse, and I have never been for one moment reconciled, for I felt it was murder, not war. We are not at war with Russia, and those they try to help don't know if they want them or not. My oldest boy was severely wounded in the last

days—26th of October. Adjutant General notified me of this, but, fortunately, I had had four letters from him. He lies in a hospital at Brema, France. It may seem strange when I tell you I can stand this bravely. I'm proud of my boy, who stayed by his gun to the last (Field Artillery, Battery A, Forty-second Division), but when he was wounded he was among white, whole-hearted people, who are caring for him. He asks me not to worry. He's being given the best of care—a good bed, plenty to eat. If it's the Lord's will that he be not returned, I should grieve for him, but there would be no bitterness in my heart, and he died for his country, while with this boy the most bitter resentment would fill my life. But don't misunderstand me; my boy is no better than another mother's boy, if he was the good, noble boy this one is, and if they are protecting them. We know they are not feeding them, but why?

I appeal to you to find out, if you can, if these few men are to be left there to starve or be murdered. Everything may be all right, but it looks bad to me, and I feel I have a right to know. I do not seek his release, as many are, only his care and protection.

I answered her letter—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. KENYON. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. I am concerned, as well as other Senators, in getting exact information from Russia. In view of the letter which has just been read, perhaps it would not be out of place for me to say that no later than last night we had as our guest a young man who told us that he had heard from his brother, who was at Archangel and was one of the American troops. The letter was written not later than the latter part of November; he gave the date, but I do not now have it in mind. The gentleman stated that his brother spoke in most complimentary terms of the comfort and accommodations they have there. I simply speak of that for what it is worth.

Mr. KENYON. I am very glad to know that, and that may be some comfort to this poor mother who can get no word from the War Department.

The second letter reads as follows:

I have stood up under the stress of this Red Cross and all that goes with it most wonderfully, but this Russian terror and suspense of waiting and wondering why has taken my heart out of the work, or, rather, made me unfit for my position. I am sending you a letter from the Carroll County paper which tells of conditions that are most discouraging. This lieutenant has the same base, but not the company, with my son. I would never know from this son if he was starving. That's one reason why some one else should find out. Trust you will regard me as an anxious, loving mother and not a nuisance to you.

The last letter—and I think as to a portion of what the mother says in this letter the mantle of charity might be thrown over it if anybody has any criticism of it, because it is from a mother's breaking heart who has heard nothing of this boy of hers in months—personally I admire the spunk of the writer:

I read with much interest the demand of Senator TOWNSEND for the Michigan people concerning the Three hundred and thirty-ninth Infantry. It is true most of these men are from Detroit. The captain of this company made a special request—which is not considered allowable—that my son be transferred to his company, which, of course, was very agreeable to him. I notice Secretary of War Baker says he has never heard complaint. Well, perhaps they went where my letter went—to the wastebasket. At least I received no reply. And had he read it he could not have truthfully said what he did. Then he disclaimed knowing of influenza. If such be true, I think it time he began to find out. I think I sent you the letter received from my son, when he said 62 of their men—some of their best—died in four days after landing at Archangel. He also told of their second lieutenant being taken from the barge as they were going up the river and died three days later. I don't believe one of these deaths has been reported. I say again, we feel, and have a just cause to do so, these men were carted off up there without much thought as to what they were going for and forgotten, and some one will be asked, and demand, that we know why. And with all due respect to our President, I think no time should be lost to cable a demand that he pause in his receptions long enough to do something for our boys at once there. We visited Camp Custer a short time before they left for over. A more splendid body of men President Wilson will not meet in all his travel. The whole of Russia would not pay for one of their lives, as it is to-day or ever will be.

Then she speaks of other things and of an attack that her boy had written about long before it was to be made.

Mr. President, I feel that I am simply performing a duty to this mother of one of these boys and to the people of my State who have boys in Russia. They are not asking that any of their sons be relieved from performing any of the real duties of this war. They feel that this war is practically over or at least that the fighting is over, and they do not want these boys of theirs left up amid those snows and the terrors of Russia to meet the terror of bolshevism when it may not be necessary. If it is necessary, all that she asks and that they ask is that those boys have proper care and proper support, and the mothers of this Nation have a right to ask for that. We may well be careful that as this war closes we do not become forgetful of the boys who have made it possible for civilization. I agree with the words expressed here a few moments ago that we have nothing to do with the kind of government the people of Russia have. It is about time to be paying some attention to the United States of America and its people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. THOMAS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Before that motion is put, I wish to ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Texas, the Chair is informed that the bill is before the Senate and that the request of the Senator is not necessary. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Colorado that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Thursday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 7, 1919.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

Huston Thompson to be a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

R. L. Williams to be United States district judge, eastern district of Oklahoma.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, January 7, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Come, Thou Almighty, with all Thy holy influence and make us one with Thee in thought and purpose in this epoch-making period in the history of the world.

Intense problems loom large before us and before all the civilized nations. Give us courage, patience, wisdom, strength, that we may uphold right and truth and justice; and guide, we beseech Thee, the great men who have been selected to form a peace pact, that it may unite the men of all nations into brotherly love; that the scenes which we have and are passing through may never disgrace mankind again. In His name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND FUNERAL OF EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

The SPEAKER announced as the committee to attend the funeral of the late Theodore Roosevelt, Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. WEBB, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. DENT, Mr. PADGETT, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. STEDMAN, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. McANDREWS, Mr. GALLIVAN, Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH, Mr. MANN, Mr. FORDNEY, Mr. GILLET, Mr. VOLSTEAD, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, Mr. KAHN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. MOTT, Mr. HICKS, Mr. CHANDLER of New York, Mr. CANNON, Mr. RODENBERG, and Mr. BOWERS.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, there appeared this morning in a Washington paper a tribute from ex-President Taft upon the late Col. Roosevelt. The tribute is so worthy of the writer and of Col. Roosevelt that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by inserting an article by ex-President Taft on Col. Roosevelt. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and regret the announcement of the death of Hon. Theodore Roosevelt, late a President of the United States.

Resolved, That a committee of 15 Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join such committee as may be appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of ex-President Roosevelt the Senate do now adjourn.

And that in compliance with the second resolution the Vice President had appointed Mr. LODGE, Mr. MARTIN of Virginia, Mr. SIMMONS, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. REED, Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HARDING, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. CALDER, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. KELLOGG, and Mr. KNOX as said committee.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DRANE, of Florida, was granted leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

RESIGNATION.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

BROOKLYN, N. Y., January 6, 1918.

Hon. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you that I have tendered my resignation as a Representative from the fourth district of the State of New York to the governor of the State. The resignation is to take effect immediately.

Sincerely, yours,

HARRY HOWARD DALE.

The SPEAKER. Ordered filed among the archives of the House.

CONTESTED-ELECTION CASE—WICKERSHAM AGAINST SULZER.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise? Mr. WILSON at Louisiana. To ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the pending election contest.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the Alaska contest case. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. When the House adjourned Saturday the previous question was ordered on these resolutions and also on the motion to recommit. Of course the motion to recommit is voted on first and the Clerk will report the motion.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order there is no quorum present. However, Mr. Speaker, I prefer the point should be raised on the vote.

The SPEAKER. That is the easiest way. The Clerk will report the Burnett motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BURNETT moves to refer the contested-election case of James Wickersham, contestant, against Charles A. Sulzer to the Committee on Elections No. 1 and said committee shall report on said case by or before February 10, 1919.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of order that there is no quorum present, and evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 131, nays 187, answered "present" 1, not voting 112, as follows:

YEAS—131.

Alexander	Crisp	Hensley	Overstreet
Almon	Crosser	Holland	Padgett
Aswell	Curry, Cal.	Huddleston	Pbelan
Ayres	Davey	Hull, Tenn.	Polk
Bankhead	Dent	Igoe	Rainey, H. T.
Barkley	Denton	Jones	Rainey, J. W.
Barnhart	Dill	Kehoe	Raker
Bell	Dixon	Kincheloe	Randall
Benson	Doolittle	Larsen	Rayburn
Blackmon	Doughton	Lazaro	Romjue
Bland, Va.	Eagan	Lee, Cal.	Rouse
Blanton	Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Rucker
Bowers	Evans	Lever	Sanders, La.
Brodbeck	Fields	Linthicum	Saunders, Va.
Buchanan	Fisher	Lockett	Shallenberger
Burnett	Flood	Loback	Shouse
Byrnes, S. C.	Foster	Lonergan	Sims
Byrns, Tenn.	Gallagher	Lundeen	Sisson
Caldwell	Gallivan	Lunn	Smith, T. F.
Candler, Miss.	Gandy	McAndrews	Snook
Cantrill	Gard	McKeown	Stegall
Caraway	Garner	McLemore	Stedman
Carlin	Garrett, Tex.	Mays	Stephens, Miss.
Church	Godwin, N. C.	Miller, Wash.	Sterling
Clark, Fla.	Goodwin, Ark.	Montague	Stevenson
Claypool	Gray, Ala.	Neely	Summers
Cleary	Hamlin	Oldfield	Taylor, Ark.
Coady	Hardy	Oliver, Ala.	Thomas
Collier	Harrison, Miss.	O'Shaunessy	Tillman
Cox	Heflin	Overmyer	Vinson

Walton
Watkins
Watson, Va.

Weaver
Webb
Welling

White, Ohio
Wilson, Tex.
Wingo

Wright
Young, Tex.

NAYS—187.

Anderson	Fess	Lampert	Sanford
Anthony	Focht	Langley	Schall
Austin	Fordney	Lehibach	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Foss	Leshner	Sears
Beakes	Frear	London	Sells
Beshlin	Freeman	Lufkin	Sherwood
Birch	French	McCulloch	Siegel
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Ill.	McFadden	Sinnott
Booher	Garrett, Tenn.	McKenzie	Small
Britten	Gillett	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Glynn	McLaughlin, Mich.	Snell
Browning	Good	Magee	Snyder
Butler	Gordon	Mann	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Gould	Mapes	Steele
Cannon	Graham, Ill.	Martin	Steenerson
Cary	Green, Iowa	Mason	Stiness
Chandler, N. Y.	Greene, Mass.	Merritt	Strong
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Sweet
Clark, Pa.	Griest	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Classon	Hadley	Morgan	Temple
Connally, Tex.	Hamilton, Mich.	Nelson, A. P.	Thompson
Cooper, Ohio	Haskell	Nelson, J. M.	Tilson
Cooper, Wis.	Hastings	Nicholls, S. C.	Timberlake
Copley	Haugen	Nolan	Towner
Crago	Hawley	Norton	Treadway
Cramton	Hayden	Osborne	Vare
Dale	Hayes	Paige	Vestal
Dallinger	Hersey	Parker, N. J.	Voigt
Darrow	Hicks	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Davis	Hilliard	Peters	Walker
Dempsey	Hollingsworth	Platt	Walsh
Denison	Houston	Porter	Ward
Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Pou	Wason
Dickinson	Humphreys	Powers	Watson, Pa.
Dies	James	Purnell	Wetly
Dillon	Johnson, Wash.	Ramsey	Whaley
Domink	Juul	Ramseyer	Wheeler
Doremus	Kahn	Rankin	White, Me.
Dowell	Kelley, Mich.	Reavis	Williams
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Reed	Wilson, Ill.
Edmonds	Kennedy, Iowa	Rodenberg	Wilson, La.
Elliott	King	Rogers	Winslow
Ellsworth	Kinkaid	Rose	Wood, Ind.
Esch	Knutson	Rowe	Woods, Iowa
Fairchild, B. L.	Kraus	Rubey	Woodward
Fairfield	La Follette	Sanders, Ind.	Zihlman
Farr	La Guardia	Sanders, N. Y.	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Slayden

NOT VOTING—112.

Ashbrook	Ferris	Kettner	Riordan
Bacharach	Flynn	Key, Ohio	Robbins
Black	Francis	Kless, Pa.	Roberts
Borland	Fuller, Mass.	Kitchin	Robinson
Brand	Garland	Kreider	Rowland
Brumbaugh	Goodall	Little	Russell
Burroughs	Graham, Pa.	Longworth	Sabath
Campbell, Pa.	Gray, N. J.	McArthur	Scott, Iowa
Carew	Gregg	McClintic	Scott, Pa.
Carter, Mass.	Griffin	McCormick	Scully
Carter, Okla.	Hamill	McLaughlin, Pa.	Shackelford
Connolly, Kans.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Madden	Sherley
Cooper, W. Va.	Harrison, Va.	Maher	Slemp
Costello	Heaton	Mansfield	Sloan
Currie, Mich.	Heintz	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Mich.
Decker	Helm	Mondell	Smith, C. B.
Delaney	Helvering	Moon	Stephens, Nebr.
Donovan	Hood	Morin	Sullivan
Dooling	Howard	Mott	Swift
Drane	Husted	Mudd	Switzer
Drukker	Hutchinson	Nichols, Mich.	Tague
Dunn	Ireland	Oliver, N. Y.	Templeton
Dyer	Jacoway	Olney	Tinkham
Elston	Johnson, Ky.	Park	Van Dyke
Emerson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pratt	Venable
Eschen	Kearns	Price	Waldow
Estopinal	Keating	Quin	Wise
Fairchild, G. W.	Kennedy, R. I.	Ragsdale	Young, N. Dak.

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. SLAYDEN (for motion to recommit) with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. KEATING with Mr. HUSTED.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. HELM with Mr. KLESS of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. ROBBINS.

Mr. PRICE with Mr. KEARNS.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. GARLAND.

Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. BURROUGHS.

Mr. ASHBROOK with Mr. COOPER of West Virginia.

Mr. BLACK with Mr. DRUKKER.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. ELSTON.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. EMERSON.

Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.
 Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.
 Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. KETTNER with Mr. IRELAND.
 Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
 Mr. MOON with Mr. LONGWORTH.
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. MOTT.
 Mr. OLIVER of New York with Mr. MUDD.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. SWIFT.
 Mr. PARK with Mr. TINKHAM.
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. WALDOW.
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. MCARTHUR.

The SPEAKER. On this vote the yeas are 131, nays 187, present 1. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?
 Mr. POU. I rise to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MANN. There is a question pending.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved,

1. That Charles A. Sulzer was not elected a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the Territory of Alaska in this Congress and is not entitled to retain a seat herein.

2. That James Wickersham was duly elected a Delegate to the House of Representatives from the Territory of Alaska in this Congress and is entitled to a seat herein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, is it too late to ask for a separation of those two questions?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

The question is on demanding the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 229, nays 64, answered "present" 13, not voting 125, as follows:

YEAS—229.

Anderson	Fisher	Lea, Cal.	Sanders, N. Y.
Anthony	Focht	Lehlbach	Saunders, Va.
Aswell	Fordney	Lever	Schall
Austin	Foss	Little	Scott, Mich.
Baer	Frear	Lobeck	Sells
Beakes	Freeman	Loneragan	Shallenberger
Beshlin	French	Lufkin	Sherwood
Birch	Fuller, Ill.	McAndrews	Shouse
Bland, Ind.	Gallagher	McCulloch	Siegel
Bland, Va.	Gallivan	McKenzie	Sinnott
Booher	Gandy	McKeown	Small
Britten	Garner	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Browne	Garrett, Tenn.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, T. F.
Browning	Gillett	Magee	Snell
Buchanan	Glynn	Mann	Snook
Butler	Good	Mapes	Snyder
Byrnes, S. C.	Goodwin, Ark.	Martin	Stafford
Campbell, Kans.	Gordon	Mason	Steele
Cannon	Gould	Merritt	Steenerson
Cary	Graham, Ill.	Miller, Wash.	Stephens, Miss.
Chandler, N. Y.	Green, Iowa	Mondell	Sterling
Chandler, Okla.	Greene, Mass.	Montague	Stiness
Clark, Pa.	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Pa.	Strong
Classon	Griest	Moore, Ind.	Summers
Clary	Hadley	Morgan	Sweet
Connally, Tex.	Hamilton, Mich.	Neely	Taylor, Ark.
Cooper, Ohio	Haskell	Nelson, A. P.	Taylor, Colo.
Cooper, Wis.	Hastings	Nelson, J. M.	Temple
Copley	Haugen	Nicholls, S. C.	Thompson
Crago	Hawley	Nolan	Tilson
Cramton	Hayden	Norton	Timberlake
Crosser	Hayes	Olney	Towner
Dale	Hensley	Osborne	Treadway
Dallinger	Hersey	O'Shaunessy	Vare
Darrow	Hicks	Paige	Vestal
Davis	Hilliard	Parker, N. J.	Volgt
Dempsey	Hollingsworth	Parker, N. Y.	Volstead
Denison	Houston	Peters	Walker
Denton	Hull, Iowa	Phelan	Walsh
Dewalt	Hull, Tenn.	Platt	Walton
Dickinson	Humphreys	Porter	Ward
Dies	Igoe	Pou	Wason
Dillon	James	Powers	Watson, Pa.
Dixon	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Welty
Dominick	Juul	Rainey, J. W.	Whaley
Dowell	Kehoe	Ramsey	Wheeler
Dunn	Kelley, Mich.	Ramseyer	White, Me.
Dupré	Kelly, Pa.	Randall	Williams
Eagan	Kennedy, Iowa	Rankin	Wilson, Ill.
Eagle	King	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Edmonds	Kinkaid	Reavis	Winslow
Elliott	Kutson	Reed	Wood, Ind.
Ellsworth	Kraus	Rodenberg	Woods, Iowa
Esch	La Follette	Rogers	Woodyard
Fairchild, B. L.	LaGuardia	Rose	Young, Tex.
Fairfield	Lampert	Rowe	
Farr	Langley	Rubey	
Fess	Lazaro	Sanders, Ind.	

NAYS—64.

Alexander	Claypool	Hedin	Overstreet
Almon	Coady	Huddleston	Raker
Bankhead	Collier	Jacoway	Romjue
Barkley	Cox	Jones	Rouse
Bell	Curry, Cal.	Key, Ohio	Rucker
Benson	Davey	Kincheloe	Sanders, La.
Blackmon	Dent	Larsen	Sisson
Blanton	Dill	Lee, Ga.	Steagall
Bowers	Evans	Leshner	Stevenson
Brodbeck	Fields	Linthicum	Tillman
Burnett	Gard	Littlepage	Vinson
Caldwell	Garrett, Tex.	Lundeen	Watkins
Candler, Miss.	Gray, Ala.	Lunn	Welling
Cantrill	Hamlin	Mays	Wilson, Tex.
Caraway	Hardy	Moon	Wingo
Church	Harrison, Miss.	Oldfield	Wright

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—13.

Barnhart	Crisp	Polk	White, Ohio
Byrns, Tenn.	Flood	Rainey, H. T.	
Carlin	Foster	Watson, Va.	
Clark, Fla.	Holland	Weaver	

NOT VOTING—125.

Ashtbrook	Flynn	London	Sanford
Ayres	Francis	Longworth	Scott, Iowa
Bacharach	Fuller, Mass.	McArthur	Scott, Pa.
Black	Garland	McClintic	Scully
Borland	Godwin, N. C.	McCormick	Sears
Brand	Goodall	McFadden	Shackleford
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sherley
Burroughs	Gray, N. J.	McLemore	Sims
Campbell, Pa.	Gregg	Madden	Slayden
Carew	Griffin	Maier	Slemp
Carter, Mass.	Hamill	Mansfield	Sloan
Carter, Okla.	Hamilton, N. Y.	Miller, Minn.	Smith, Mich.
Connolly, Kans.	Harrison, Va.	Morin	Smith, C. B.
Cooper, W. Va.	Heaton	Mott	Stedman
Costello	Heintz	Mudd	Stephens, Nebr.
Currie, Mich.	Helm	Nichols, Mich.	Sullivan
Decker	Helvering	Oliver, Ala.	Swift
Delaney	Hood	Oliver, N. Y.	Switzer
Donovan	Howard	Overmyer	Tague
Dooling	Husted	Padgett	Templeton
Doolittle	Hutchinson	Park	Thomas
Doremus	Ireland	Pratt	Tinkham
Doughton	Johnson, Ky.	Price	Van Dyke
Drane	Johnson, S. Dak.	Quin	Venale
Drukner	Kahn	Ragsdale	Waldow
Dyer	Kearns	Riordan	Webb
Elston	Keating	Robbins	Wise
Emerson	Kennedy, R. I.	Roberts	Young, N. Dak.
Essen	Kettner	Robinson	Zihlman
Estopinal	Kiess, Pa.	Rowland	
Fairchild, G. W.	Kitchin	Russell	
Ferris	Kreider	Sabath	

So the resolutions were agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota (for) with Mr. SLAYDEN (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. SIMS with Mr. LONGWORTH.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. MANN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolutions were agreed to was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker of the House may be made a member of the committee to attend the funeral of the late President of the United States, Mr. Roosevelt.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the gentleman makes that request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POU). The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the name of the Speaker of the House be added to the committee which, by the direction of the House, will attend the funeral of ex-President Roosevelt. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order to-morrow may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the business in order to-morrow may be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RELIEF IN EUROPE.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk to be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the participation by the Government of the United States in the furnishing of foodstuffs and other urgent supplies, and for the transportation, distribution, and administration

thereof to such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President from time to time as necessary, and for each and every purpose connected therewith, in the discretion of the President, \$100,000,000, which may be used as a revolving fund until June 30, 1919, and which shall be audited where practicable in the same manner as other expenditures of the Government are audited: *Provided*, That expenditures hereunder shall be reimbursed so far as possible by the Governments or subdivisions thereof or the peoples to whom relief is furnished: *Provided further*, That a report of the receipts and expenditures under this appropriation shall be submitted to Congress not later than the first day of the next regular session.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I did not catch the gentleman's request.

Mr. SHERLEY. It was for unanimous consent for consideration. I was about to make a statement to the House.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if unanimous consent should be granted, it was my intention, having consulted with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET], the ranking Member of the Committee on Appropriations, to ask that two hours and a half be given for consideration, and that at the end of that time the previous question should be considered as ordered and a vote had upon the passage of the bill. The gentleman from Massachusetts will state, I think, that the time is satisfactory to him.

Mr. LITTLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman one question. I notice this relief is confined entirely to Europe. There are several million Armenian Christians on the borders of Europe. How does it happen that they are not included in this measure?

Mr. SHERLEY. The request that came by virtue of the cable from the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, and which was transmitted to the House, and which is found in House Document 1640, confined it to Europe, as the bill does, and in the absence of a specific request for funds to be expended outside of Europe the committee would not feel warranted in going beyond the request.

Mr. LITTLE. Would not the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations accept and agree to an amendment including Armenia?

Mr. SHERLEY. I would not feel warranted at this time to announce that I would accept such an amendment.

Mr. LITTLE. The people of this country are being asked for many millions for that purpose, and I think that that neighborhood is more needy than any other.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. LANGLEY. Does the gentleman's request propose to exclude the opportunity of offering amendments? I did not quite catch it.

Mr. SHERLEY. As submitted, it would simply bring the matter up for a direct vote as proposed. I do not know that I have any special desire to curtail opportunity to offer amendments. It is desired, if possible, to complete the consideration of this bill in time to enable several of us to leave for New York. But, of course, that, while it is a personal reason, is not a sufficient reason for any particular rule.

Mr. LITTLE. I would like to finish my inquiry. In view of the fact that Armenia is a Christian people, as much distressed and more distressed than any that will be involved in this measure in Europe, and in view of the fact that more efforts are being made to secure from the people of America by free gifts and contributions aid for Armenia than for any other country, I shall have to withhold my consent unless some arrangement is made to include Armenia in this bill or opportunity to put it in.

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman will appreciate that I am not in a position to undertake to get unanimous consent by terms such as he proposes. I might be in entire sympathy with the gentleman's proposal, and yet in the absence of more information touching the matter I would not feel warranted, on behalf of the committee, in saying that I would agree to an amendment of that kind.

Mr. LITTLE. I understood the gentleman's request was that this bill should be passed without any opportunity for amendment.

Mr. SHERLEY. I simply offered a proposal of that kind. If the House does not desire to do that, why the matter can be thrown open to amendment. I realize both the importance of the matter and the very proper desire of the House to consider it fully. I have no wish to interfere with that desire in any way.

Mr. LITTLE. If the gentleman from Kentucky will modify his request so as to afford opportunity for amendment, I will not object; but if he will not, I shall object.

Mr. SHERLEY. My request, which is pending, is for consideration, and does not involve the question of amendments at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understood the gentleman to say that at the end of the debate the previous question would be ordered.

Mr. SHERLEY. I said I should like to request that. I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] state his position touching the matter.

Mr. GILLET. I have been trying to get an opportunity to do that, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I understand this is a request for unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say that, for one, I am opposed to this resolution, and I suggested to the gentleman from Kentucky—with which suggestion he entirely agreed—that this is a matter of such momentous importance that the House ought to have opportunity for full consideration and debate. Now, I say this in all fairness to the House, so that if there are any Members who wish time against the resolution they may be forewarned: This request has just been presented, and already enough gentlemen have spoken to me to consume the entire 1 hour and 15 minutes which would be allotted to me in opposition; so that if there are other Members, as very likely there may be, who wish time on either side of the House in opposition to the resolution—for in the committee the opposition was not partisan—I shall be unable to give it to them. Therefore, if there are other gentlemen, the time for debate ought to be extended.

Mr. GORDON. I should like 10 or 15 minutes against this proposition.

Mr. LANGLEY. I should like to have some time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In view of the fact that this is a request for unanimous consent, and that it involves a tax of \$1 per capita on every man, woman, and child in the United States, for purposes not fully explained, I object. We have a great deal of distress and suffering in the United States.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will reserve his objection for a moment—

Mr. SEARS. Regular order!

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will withhold his objection—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I will not withhold my objection to unanimous consent to take \$100,000,000 and give it to people in unknown lands for unknown purposes. The time has come to put a stop to this universal altruism, which takes money out of our Treasury.

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman will permit, I am not asking him to support the bill. I am asking him to withhold his objection in order to allow me to make a statement to the House.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Certainly, I will do that.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will try not to delay the House unduly.

The SPEAKER. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. SHERLEY. I shall not take over five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is perfectly apparent that, irrespective of whether individual Members may favor or oppose this proposition, it is of sufficient magnitude and importance to America and to the world to deserve the consideration of the House of Representatives. Now, there are two methods by which that consideration can be secured. It can either be taken up by unanimous consent or it can be made in order under a rule. We are in a short session of the Congress, in which, with our very best efforts to accommodate the various views of Members on different subjects, we will have difficulty in disposing of the most important business. Being personally responsible for the presentation of a considerable part of that business to the House, I should like to save unnecessary work in connection with the consideration of matters that will have to be considered. I think it is easily within the strong probabilities that in the absence of unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, its consideration can and will be made in order by the machinery of a rule. It seems to me that as practical men there is nothing to be gained by forcing the aid of that machinery in order to consider this proposal. I do not want it considered by the House in any way except fully and fairly, and in such manner as to reflect the judgment of the House, and all I desired this morning was to get it up for consideration, and then I would try to adjust the matter of terms to the desires of the House. May I suggest this: Would it meet the views of the gentleman if consent was given to take up the matter immediately after the reading of the Journal upon Thursday? I am willing to agree to any proper

debate, and, under the five-minute rule, it would be subject to any germane amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. I suggest to the gentleman that he give the day of Thursday to it. That is not unreasonable in a matter of this importance.

Mr. SHERLEY. My only hesitancy about it is that we are getting well along into January, this Congress will die on the 4th of March, and there are a great many bills of importance to be considered. The Committee on Military Affairs have a number of bills to present, and important supply bills are yet to be considered. I want to accommodate the House. I submit, gentlemen, in all fairness, with a sober appreciation of the responsibility that rests upon us as individuals, that we must all forego somewhat of our natural desire for debate in the consideration of matters if we are to begin to do the business that presses before Congress.

Mr. McKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. McKENZIE. In regard to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky fixing Thursday for the consideration of this matter, I want to ask him whether or not he would consent that it should be taken up after the disposition of the bill now pending for the settlement of contracts in which a great many American citizens are deeply interested.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will excuse the Chair, the Chair will state that the arrangement is that to-morrow, having dispensed with calendar Wednesday, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] will be recognized to bring in a rule in regard to the bill the gentleman from Illinois refers to.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, we have had that understanding for a number of days, but one thing and another has intervened, and we have got no action. For one I shall object to the consideration of a bill of this character when our own people are so deeply interested in the contract bill.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will not the gentleman concede that since there is great distress prevailing among families of the soldiers and sailors of the United States who have offered their lives in the service abroad, there is ample business for the President and the Congress to do in the United States without taxing the people another hundred million of dollars to involve us further in foreign affairs?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not desire to take the time of the House now to discuss the merits of the proposal. Sufficient to say that in my judgment this proposal, aside from the humanitarian aspect, which is such that it necessarily appeals to all humane men, has in it to my mind more of value in helping to bring about actual peace in the world and thereby relieve the United States of the burden of war than any proposal likely to come before Congress now or in the future. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it the judgment of the gentleman from Kentucky that the United States should of itself donate this \$100,000,000 and to continue to donate other sums for the relief of all the people of all the earth for all time?

Mr. SHERLEY. I suggest to the gentleman that we ought not to enter into a discussion of the merits of the bill at this time.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Kentucky has stated the sympathetic side, and I am stating that this money comes out of the bone and sinew of the people of the United States.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to suggest to the gentleman that I agree with him entirely that there is pressing business before Congress, and that we all ought to suppress our love for debate as much as we can. On the other hand, I think the gentleman will admit that no more far-reaching and important proposition probably will come before us than this proposition of the United States entering into and becoming the great almoner of the poor of Europe. It seems to me that one day for its consideration will not be too much.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will agree to do this if it meets with the approval of the House: If the bill from the Military Affairs Committee, the contract bill, shall not have been concluded before Thursday, that immediately after its conclusion this bill shall be taken up, with two hours of debate on a side, and that it shall then be read under the five-minute rule for amendment.

Mr. GILLETT. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, after the consideration of the military contract bill, if that bill should be pending, and if not, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the bill which I have just had read at the Clerk's desk be taken up for consideration; that there shall be two hours' debate on a side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT]

and one half by myself; that after the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment and final passage, and that general debate be limited to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that next Thursday, at the conclusion of the military contract bill, if that bill is still pending, or if that is out of the way, as soon as the Journal is read and matters on the Speaker's table are disposed of, this \$100,000,000 charity proposition be taken up; that there shall be two hours' debate on each side, one half to be controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] and one half by himself; and that then the bill be taken up for amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this proposition involves an increase of taxation on our already heavily taxed people, and I think they ought to have time to reflect upon it. I object.

Mr. SHERLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I desire to serve notice that I shall ask the Committee on Rules for a rule for the consideration of the bill, and I trust that it will be presented to the House on Thursday.

SWEARING IN OF A DELEGATE.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I present the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. WICKERSHAM], who has just been seated by a vote of the House.

Mr. WICKERSHAM appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office prescribed by law.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. GREGG (at the request of Mr. SLAYDEN) was given leave of absence indefinitely on account of illness.

SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE FOR TO-MORROW.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. GARRETT, to preside as Speaker pro tempore to-morrow.

PAYMENT OF ALLOTMENTS OF ENLISTED MEN.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and take up out of its order the bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued, and put the same on its passage, with the amendments of the committee. The bill has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13306) to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued.

Whereas in the act known as the act to authorize the establishment of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department provision was made for the payment of allotments to the beneficiaries indicated in a proper authority of allotment by the men enlisted in the military service of the United States; and

Whereas under this provision many enlisted men filed the proper papers authorizing such payments with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; and Whereas in these cases and pursuant to this authority payments were regularly made to the beneficiaries up to July 1, 1918, by this bureau; and Whereas as of that date the payments of allotments not carrying allowances was ordered to be discontinued pursuant to the recommendation of the War Department pending the receipt of a new authority of allotment from the enlisted man; and

Whereas many of these new authorities have never been received by the War Department, owing to the inability of the parties in interest to communicate with the soldiers; and

Whereas the discontinuance of the payment of these duly authorized allotments has operated to the very great detriment and suffering, in many cases, of the allottees; Now, therefore

Be it enacted, etc., That in all of those cases in which an authority of allotment by an enlisted man directing the payment of an indicated amount to a designated beneficiary is on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and payments pursuant to this authority had been made by said bureau prior to July 1, 1918, but which payments were discontinued as of that date, the War Department is directed to resume the payments of allotments in these cases, pursuant to the authority on file as aforesaid, pending the receipt of a new authority, or of a written rescission of the old authority, from the enlisted man. In those cases in which, pending the receipt of the new authority, the military authorities, beginning with July 1, 1918, have reserved from month to month out of the soldier's monthly accruing pay the amount directed to be paid by the original authority of allotment, the War Department, upon resuming the payment of allotments in such cases, under the authority of this act, shall pay all arrearages out of these respective reservations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the bill, but so that we may have a hearing I demand a second.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] 20 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a brief statement in connection with this bill, one which I hope

will make it abundantly clear why it was necessary that the bill should be introduced, and why it should be passed. Since the introduction of this bill, which was primarily intended to meet the situation arising in my own district out of the action of the War Department, I have received letters from many portions of the United States, showing the suffering of large numbers of allottees arising out of this ill-advised discontinuance of the payment of soldiers' allotments not carrying allowances. There are very many thousands of these cases. Members of this House are doubtless aware that in the act creating the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, the soldiers were authorized to make allotments out of their pay to such persons as under the regulations might be designated by them as allottees and that a further provision was made that in case of certain dependents, the Government would supplement this allotment with an allowance. I wish to say in this connection that my bill does not deal with those allotments that carry allowances, but is concerned exclusively with allotments without allowances. It was provided in the act to which I refer, that the payments of these allotments should be made under regulations agreed upon and promulgated by the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of War. These regulations were promulgated, and conformably thereto the payment of allotments was begun in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and continued therein for some time. Prior to July 1, last, the War Department for reasons best known to itself, decided to recommend the discontinuance of the payment of all allotments that did not carry allowances, and to require a new authority of allotment from the soldier. The result of that action has been, as doubtless has been made clear to Members of the House by hundreds of letters from their constituents, that payment of very many of these allotments which was in progress of payment as of July 1 last, was not only discontinued as of that date, but has never been resumed.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Can the gentleman give any reason why the War Department discontinued the payment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The War Department has never afforded any reason for its recommendation of discontinuance which was satisfactory either to the Members of Congress, or to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce which considered this bill. This department gave out a reason to the following effect, that the discontinuance and taking over of the payment of these allotments by the War Department, was rendered necessary by virtue of some supposed amendment to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance Act passed by this body. I undertake to say in this connection that no such amendment was ever passed, and that this House at no time, either consciously, or unconsciously, has done anything which made this action necessary on the part of the War Department.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. This bill provides for the payment of these claims which were discontinued in the War Risk Insurance Bureau and authorized to be transferred to the Quartermaster General of the Army?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The War Department had the right to take over the payment of these allotments. This jurisdiction originally belonged to the War Department, and there would not have been the slightest objection to its taking over the payment of the allotments if, after taking over that jurisdiction, or resuming it on their part, it had continued to make payment in those cases in which payment had begun, and for which sufficient authority was on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. This bill relates only to those cases in which actual payments under the authority of regulations promulgated by the War and Navy Departments, were in progress in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. The delay was caused by the discontinuance in the War Risk Bureau, directing them to be paid by the Quartermaster General.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In part by the discontinuance of payment in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and in further part by the failure of the War Department to continue the payment of the discontinued allotments. No payments have been made since July 1, except in cases where a new authority has been afforded.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. And they have been unable to get that new authority.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In many instances, they have been unable to do so. Some of the soldiers sought to be reached were in prison, some of them were missing, and some of them were dead. I wish to say that it is a fair estimate to assume that to-day there are from one to five million dollars in the hands of the War Department which have accrued in consequence of this discontinuance of payment. This will give some idea of the extent of this mischief.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. I have many cases of this kind: A private soldier allotted to his mother, dependent upon him, \$15, with the statement that he had contributed that amount. They paid his mother not only that \$15 but \$15 more, as I recollect the case. The mother was asked subsequently, after 6 or 8 or 10 months, what he had contributed theretofore, and the answer came that he had contributed \$25 a month. Now, then, they have stopped paying her and demand that she shall refund the money and are taking his allotment of \$15 month by month to reduce that amount that had been advanced to the mother. Does this bill apply to such cases?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that while I am familiar with cases of the character cited, because I imagine every Member of this body has cases of that sort, this bill does not apply to that situation, for the reason that payments in those cases are still being made in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. This bill applies only to the payment of allotments not carrying allowances, the jurisdiction of which has been assumed by the War Department. I will say to the gentleman that the situation to which he refers is doubtless met by a bill that is now before, if it has not been reported, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and which was introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. This bill does not deal with that situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the phraseology of the measure, would it permit payment of allotments in those cases where since July 1, 1918, the allotments have not been reserved by the War Department?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why in that particular should the Government pay money in cases where the money has not been reserved by the Government from the soldier's pay?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am very glad the gentleman has asked that question, for the reason that it affords the opportunity in this connection to show that the difficulty raised by the gentleman from Wisconsin, is not a real difficulty. If the gentleman will read the bill he will find that the bill relates to two situations of fact. First, to those cases in which the allotment payments were in progress as of July 1 last, and in which the War Department from that time forward, has reserved out of the soldier's pay the amounts necessary to pay the allotments.

Mr. STAFFORD. There can be no objection to that phase of the question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Permit me to conclude. There are many cases of that sort. I have in my pocket now numerous letters written to me by mothers, and other allottees in regard to discontinued allotments, to the effect that their sons have written to them to inquire whether their allotments were being regularly paid, and stating further that the amount necessary for the payment of same was being taken out of their monthly pay. In these cases the gentleman will see that the bill provides that upon the resumption of payment of allotments under the old authority which is now on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and which is available to the War Department, it shall pay all arrearages. This is entirely proper, because the money for that purpose is in the hands of the War Department. Now take those cases in which the War Department has not reserved out of the soldier's pay the amount fixed in the original authority of allotment. The bill prescribes that upon resumption of payment, the War Department in these cases shall pay from that time forward, and pay only the amount carried by the authority of allotment. This statement answers I think the query of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STAFFORD. Where is that phraseology? I have read the bill very carefully. I notice in the report the gentleman commented on that phase:

Since the discontinuance of the payment of allotments on July last, in many if not all of these cases, the necessary amount to meet the designated allotment has been reserved out of the soldier's pay.

Where in the bill does it provide for the protection of the Treasury in the way indicated by the gentleman?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In this way: The bill provides that—

In all those cases in which an authority of allotment by an enlisted man directing the payment of an indicated amount to a designated beneficiary is on file in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, and payment pursuant to this authority has been made by said bureau prior to July 1, 1918, but which payments were discontinued as of that date, the War and Navy Departments are directed to resume the payment of allotments in those cases, pursuant to the authority on file as aforesaid.

That is to say, under that authority the department upon the resumption of payments, would pay the monthly allotments only from that time forward. In order to make it abundantly clear

that in those cases the department will not pay arrearages, you will notice the following language in the next sentence:

Pending the receipt of a new authority, or of a written rescission of the old authority from the enlisted man. In those cases in which pending the receipt of the new authority, the military authorities, beginning with July 1, 1918, have reserved from month to month out of the soldier's monthly accruing pay, the amount directed to be paid by the original authority of allotment, the War and Navy Departments, upon resuming the payment of allotments in such cases, under the authority of this act, shall pay all arrearages out of these respective reservations.

The two paragraphs taken in connection make it very clear that arrearages are to be paid only in those cases in which the War Department has reserved the amounts necessary to meet them.

Mr. STAFFORD. But under the phraseology of this bill payment may be made to allottees where the allotment is no longer being reserved by the Government?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think so at all.

Mr. STAFFORD. The report says it may be payable in such cases. Where is the language to prevent it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have pointed out that the War Department is to resume payment under and by virtue of existing authorizations which fact, in itself, would carry the idea that the payments would be from that time forward, but in order to make it further clear that arrearages shall not be paid in those cases in which the soldier has been paid his monthly pay in full, the bill directs that arrearages shall be paid in those cases only in which reservations have been made. Any bureau head, or other official who would undertake to pay arrearages under this bill in those cases in which arrearages have not been reserved out of the soldier's pay, ought to be promptly separated from the service of the Government.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan. Will the gentleman tell the House of the inadequate method employed in informing soldiers that they were required to make a new allotment?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; I will say to the gentleman that under the authority of the original act, hundreds of thousands of soldiers all over the United States filed the proper authorizations with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, directing allotments to be paid out of their pay. Payment of these allotments had begun in many, many of these cases prior to July 1, last. Then when the War Department took over this jurisdiction, which I admit belonged to the War Department, it discontinued payment of every soldier's allotment not carrying an allowance, without regard to what had been in progress before that time. The department took up these cases with the organization commanders at home, and in France, and directed them to call the attention of the soldiers to the fact that a new authority of allotment was necessary. Having in mind the uncertainty of the mails, and the difficulty of reaching the soldiers abroad, and the further fact that many of these organization commanders were carrying very acute responsibilities in connection with the actual conduct of operations in the field, the House will be very well able to understand that there are to-day thousands of soldiers who have not only never filed a new authority of allotment, but who have not been made aware of the fact that it was necessary to file any such authority.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. DOWELL. I am heartily in favor of this proposition, but it occurs to me it might be limited by the language of this bill. I notice in the bill this language:

And payments pursuant to this authority which had been made by said bureau prior to July 1, 1918.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Now, assuming that the allotment was properly filed originally and that no payments had been made prior to July 1, the application in such a case will not receive attention under the bill?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is true, and these cases were intentionally omitted because I did not wish to complicate the bill by including any matter with respect to which the War Department might raise difficulties. I have limited the bill to the cases which have been adjudicated, and with respect to which payments were actually in progress on July 1 last.

Mr. DOWELL. Will it not be for cases that have not been paid?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It will not affect them at all. All those cases are now in the War Department. With respect to these cases the soldiers will have to proceed by securing a new authority.

Mr. DOWELL. Should not the bill provide, or should not there be an amendment to the bill providing, that these applica-

tions that have been filed should be considered by the department as though filed since that time, and should not those applications, which I know take in a great number, and which will be deprived of having the consideration of the department, have the same consideration by the department?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think that you should complicate this bill by adding a situation with respect to which there is likely to be controversy. By adding such a situation an excuse for delay will be afforded. If you desire to reach those cases you can do so by another bill. I am not prepared to say with respect to the suggestion made by the gentleman that it ought to be agreed to in this offhand way. The situation outlined in this bill calls for no investigation, because there is no controversy as to the facts.

Mr. DOWELL. There is no question but this bill should pass, but I wanted to include the others.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I desire to say further that I had a hearing on this bill before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and Gen. Lord was there. An effort has been made to fix the responsibility for this discontinuance upon Congress. Doubtless every Member has received letters from the War Department or letters from that department have been forwarded by our constituents, in which it was stated that this discontinuance was due to some act, or amendment on our part. I desire to repeat the statement that I heretofore made, that there is not a line in any bill passed by Congress that made necessary the discontinuance of these payments.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Did the War Department in the hearing attempt to give the reason why these allotments had been stopped and the payments to the soldiers in some cases discontinued and kept out of the pay of the soldier and in others were paid to the soldier?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That particular feature was not developed, and I wish to say that I have the letter of the Secretary of War that was sent to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In this letter he undertakes to discuss this entire situation and to furnish reasons for the action of the War Department. The amendment that we are supposed to have passed was in June, 1918, and this letter of the Secretary of War relates solely to the legislation of 1917. The act of 1918, as I have stated, could not possibly have made necessary the discontinuance of payments of allotments not carrying allowances, and the claim is not even made in the letter of the Secretary.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman intend to read the letter?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not care to do so. If anyone desires to read it, I will hand it to him. It is a three-page letter. It may be put in the Record if anyone wishes that action to be taken.

Mr. ESCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. ESCH. Had the War and Navy Departments accepted certified copies of the allotments that had been filed with the War Risk Insurance Bureau, would there have been this difficulty?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will say in response to that question, that in every one of the cases covered by this bill there is on file a sufficient authority of allotment in the Bureau of War Risk Insurance. All the War Department needed for the purpose of continuing to make payments with respect to any one of these cases, was to secure a copy of the appropriate authorization from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If there are any further questions to be asked, I would like five additional minutes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman be allowed to conclude his remarks.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will be very glad to answer any additional questions.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman incorporate the letter from the War Department in the Record?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the letter to which I referred be made a part of my remarks in this connection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the letter from the War Department be incorporated in his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I find that not all of those who write to me are in that particular difficulty. By what principle do they determine who should be turned over to the War Department and who should yet be retained in the War Risk Insurance Bureau?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That was determined in this way. The allotments that carried allowances were paid in part out of the Treasury of the United States. Hence the appropriate jurisdiction in those cases belonged to the Treasury Department, as the Bureau of War Risk Insurance is a branch of that department; but where the allotment is paid entirely out of the pay of the soldier, the jurisdiction in regard to that case appropriately belongs to the War Department.

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Why did they not take over all the allotments paid, then, rather than a part of it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. As I have stated, the War Department took over the cases which belonged to its jurisdiction, and they were the cases of allotments which did not carry allowances. It could not take over the payment of allotments carrying allowances, for the reason that such cases were within the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. FIELDS. There were a great many cases that were not adjudicated at the time that this transfer was made, although the soldier had been inducted into the service and had filed his application for the allotment. Does the bill under consideration in any way direct the War Department to accept those applications filed with the Bureau of War Risk Insurance?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It does not deal with unadjudicated or possibly controverted cases. It deals exclusively with those cases with respect to which there can be no controversy.

Mr. FIELDS. Would it not expedite the matter to add an amendment to the bill directing the War Department to accept this as proper authority for the consideration of the claims?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think that such action would complicate the matter.

Mr. FIELDS. I do not see how that can complicate the matter. What is the difference between an application filed somewhere in France and forwarded here and an application filed with the commanding officer of the soldier at the time he enlisted, which went to the Bureau of War Risk Insurance? Either one is a proper authority for investigation as to whether or not the beneficiary is entitled to an allotment, and if the soldier is earning the pay and allots \$15 of it a month to his mother or some other dependent or relative, there is not very much controversy about it, and that would result in the settlement of these cases, whereas as the matter now stands, they will probably never be settled.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If the War Department desires to settle such cases it can do so by its own action. I have estimated that of these discontinued cases there must be at least 50 in each congressional district. Many of the Members of the House have told me that this is far too low an estimate.

Mr. FIELDS. I wish there were only 50 in my district.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I understand that in many districts the number is believed to be many more than 50, but I have put it at 50. If there are only 50 to a district, averaging the country through, that would make about 20,000 of these discontinued allotments. If we estimate that the average allotment in these cases would be \$10, that would make an aggregate discontinuance of \$200,000 a month, and inasmuch as six months have elapsed since this order began to operate, there must necessarily be in the hands of the War Department something like \$1,200,000 which ought to have been paid over long since to the allottees of the soldiers. If there are a greater number of these cases in the districts than my estimate assumes, and there are no authentic figures on the subject, the amount due the deferred allottees will be proportionately increased.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given an additional minute. I want to ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am heartily in accord with the statement of the gentleman from Virginia. I was present at the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, waiting to be heard on a bill of mine, also an amendment to the War Risk Insurance act, and I now would ask that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] accept the proposition as contained in my bill as an amendment to his bill if it is brought up at the present time for consideration.

The point of my bill, Mr. Speaker, is this: There have been innumerable cases where the War Risk Insurance Bureau or the War Department have asked for a refund from the relatives of the soldier. That refund they have asked under clause 210 of the War Risk Insurance act, which provides for reexamination by questionnaires, or otherwise, as the bureau may direct. Now, those refunds could come about in three different ways: First, by the payment of cash by the people who received the benefit of the allotment and allowance; second, by deducting the amount from the allowances that may in the future be paid or may not up to that time have been paid; and third, by charging it against the soldier's allotment. All three of these methods seem unfair to the soldier; but the third course is the one to which I most particularly object. An allotment from the soldier is nothing more nor less than the soldier's request that his pay be transferred to his relatives through the War Risk Insurance Bureau or through the War Department or Navy Department. It is his absolute pay, and he could have it paid to him direct, rather than paid by the departments if he so desired. Now, then—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TREADWAY. In just one moment, if I may proceed. The War Department or the War Risk Insurance Bureau, if the case preceded last July, has notified people that they would receive no more allowances, and in addition to that say, "Unless you pay back this money in cash, we will charge it against the soldier's allotment." That is what I object to; that the soldier's own pay should be taken for a revision of the allowances already made by the department.

Now, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I want to inquire as to the number of the gentleman's bill and whether it has been reported?

Mr. TREADWAY. My bill is H. R. 13273. I would like to ask the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] if he would be willing to accept, as an addition to his bill, my bill as an amendment thereto; that is, to incorporate my bill with his?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Has your bill been reported?

Mr. TREADWAY. It has not been reported by the committee, and the reason why it has not been acted upon by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce is that they some time ago, at the time of our hearing, asked the War Department for its views on the measure, which have never been submitted. They again asked yesterday for the views of the department. I have had a communication with Mr. Nesbit in reference to the proposition contained in the bill, and I would be glad to submit extracts from a letter I have received from him.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. In a moment. For instance, I read this: The discontinuance of the family allowance in cases of this character works a great hardship and causes a great deal of complaint. The bureau, however, has no discretion in the matter because the allowance under the law as it stands does not exist, and therefore can not be paid.

The bureau takes the attitude that it is acting within the law in charging back these amounts against the men paid. I have talked with Assistant Secretary Love, who has had charge of the War Risk Bureau, and he said it was up to the department to execute the law as interpreted by the bureau, but it was up to Congress, if it desired, to change the law. And that is what we should do. The bureau originally made these allowances and allotments and the people accepted the payments in good faith. If future examination on the part of the bureau or the department shows that the allowance should not have been paid, then start your slate from the time of the reexamination. Begin your bookkeeping when they change their ruling, and not charge back over a period of a year or more against the man's pay or allowance which the dependents of the soldier have already expended.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TREADWAY. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. MANN. I am sorry, but I have promised all my time. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am very much in favor of the passage of this bill. I think it might be well to explain to the House the reasons which were given by the War Depart-

ment and by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance for this transfer. The reasons did not appear to me to be sufficient, and it does not seem to me that the department ought to have ordered the transfer; yet I think the House is entitled to a statement of those reasons, for whatever they may be worth.

You will recall that the war-risk act itself did not confer upon the War or Navy Department the power to retain allotments, nor it did not confer upon soldiers the power to make allotments. That power already existed in the War and Navy Departments. There have been for some years provisions of the law authorizing men in the Army and the Navy to make allotments through the War and Navy Departments, so that the War and Navy Departments already had authority to make allotments to relatives wherever they were designated by the soldier or sailor. The war-risk insurance act did not take that authority from the War Department, but conferred it in addition upon the War Risk Insurance Bureau, so that in the execution of the law the Bureau of War Risk Insurance found itself authorized to deduct these allotments and pay them, and the War Department itself had the same authority. They began to confer one with the other, and by the 1st of July they had arrived at the conclusion that in all cases where the allotment carried no allowance the War Department ought to resume the jurisdiction which it already had independent of the war-risk insurance act, and all of the allotments which were in that situation were turned over to the War Department. The mistake that the Bureau of War Risk Insurance made, and that the War Department made, was in not accepting the allotments made by the soldier originally, and having either a certified copy of that allotment sent from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Quartermaster General's office, or having the original papers sent from the Bureau of War Risk Insurance to the Quartermaster General's office; and when the question was asked Gen. Love as to why that was not done, he said the Auditor for the War Department took the position that the War Department had no authority to pay an allotment unless it came through the War Department.

Mr. McFADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McFADDEN. How many claims are pending affected by this bill?

Mr. BARKLEY. My recollection is that the estimate of Gen. Love, who had charge of this matter, was that there were something over 200,000 claims of this sort that were affected, but that the increase in the number of allotments that came through the War Department following the issue of this order amounted to something like 200,000; and they were only able to account for this additional 200,000 by assuming that they were reallocations, made by the soldiers who had been able to receive the notices which they sent out; but it is very probable that there are 20,000 to 25,000, or perhaps more, who are affected by this bill, where the men in France or in Russia or in Belgium or Italy or in hospitals or German prison camps were never able to receive the notices and are still under the impression that their relatives are receiving the allotments, whereas they are not receiving them.

Mr. McFADDEN. So that there are probably a quarter of a million dependents who are not receiving the allotments which have been made to them by soldiers?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; there are not a quarter of a million, because probably 200,000 have made new allotments, and that would leave perhaps twenty-five to thirty thousand soldiers whose allotments are not being received by their relatives.

Mr. IGOE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. IGOE. Did the Quartermaster General on July 1 allow this \$15 to go back on the man's pay, or did he continue to hold it out in all cases?

Mr. BARKLEY. They held it for a reasonable time, as they estimated it, to give the soldier a chance to make a new allotment, and where they did not receive the new allotment they began after a while to pay him the full pay.

Mr. IGOE. What did they do with the pay that they had held up? Did they pay it to him?

Mr. BARKLEY. They paid it to him after the 1st of July. There was no back pay prior to that date.

Mr. IGOE. That which they had held up?

Mr. BARKLEY. If they held up the July pay and the August pay, then, in September and October, if they did not receive a new allotment, they assumed that the man did not intend to make a new allotment and paid him the back pay. Perhaps in some cases, where they have not been able to reach the man, they have not paid it, but the War Department takes the position that in all these cases where they have been able to reach the man and no new allotment has been made it is not his inten-

tion to make a new allotment, and they have paid him the entire amount of his pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the intention to pay the beneficiary or allottee money that has not been reserved?

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would seem to be so from the phraseology of the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not the intention, and I think there should be added these words, page 2, after the word "cases," in line 11, "from the passage of this act," or some words like that, so as to indicate that it was not retroactive as to allotments not held in reserve.

Mr. STAFFORD. There should be some such amendment in order that there shall be no double pay.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Has the gentleman seen a letter from the War Department saying that the action was due to some kind of amendment to the war-risk act passed by Congress?

Mr. BARKLEY. No; I have not seen it; but I have received word from several Members who have received some such letter. I do not know who sent such a letter. There was no amendment to the War Risk Bureau act that would warrant that. It was an administrative matter worked out by the War Risk Insurance Bureau and the War Department.

Mr. DENISON. I have received a number of such letters.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not undertake to say just where the blame lies, but it has been a gross and burning outrage that under such legislation as was enacted, under the administration efforts of various departments, men who were enlisted in the Army, either by voluntary enlistment or under the selective-draft law, were told that they could allot a part of their pay to help sustain dependents upon them while the soldiers were away from home, either in camp training in this country or on the other side in the fighting line or in training there, and having been told that and having made the allotment and having had the amount of their allotment deducted from their own pay, after fighting over there, coming home, such as have come home, and others who want to come home, find out that this great and good Government of ours lied to them, has not kept faith with them, has not kept the promises which were made to them—that having deducted the amount from their own pay failed to make the payment to the mother or the father or the brother or the sister or the children, as it might be, who were dependent upon them for support. These people at home, or some of them, have suffered for food; many have suffered for raiment; many have suffered for heat; and many have been taken care of as a matter of charity by their neighbors or the Red Cross.

During a long experience in this House I have discovered that a great duty of the executive branch of the Government is not to do a thing but to give excuses why it does not do it. Here the War Risk Bureau was making the payments, theoretically, and if they made them regularly they did better than they are doing now, and somebody transferred the making of the payments to the Quartermaster General's office of the Army, and while the Quartermaster General's office of the Army knows enough about it to deduct the amount of the allotment from the soldier's pay, it does not know enough about it to warrant it to pay the amount deducted to the dependent parents. Nothing more ridiculous could be imagined. Somebody ought to be blamed for it. This bill seeks to cure it as a legislative proposition. I do not know, but I assume that probably it does not require legislation. It is proper to have legislation because that is a direction. We ought to go further. I appreciate the great trouble of developing a wonderful, complete organization in a short time. No doubt the War Department had a tremendous responsibility in developing this organization. The War Risk Insurance Bureau had a great responsibility in developing its organization. Both of them have miserably failed, so far as the payment of soldiers' allotments to their dependents is concerned. It is a disgrace to a civilized community that we are about to consider a bill to appropriate \$100,000,000 for the benefit of the poor in Europe—I think we ought to pass that bill—while at the same time we have not developed the machinery to pay the money to the poor people at home who under the law are entitled to it as a part of the pay which the Government has provided for its men in the military service. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that under a motion to suspend the rules.

Mr. BARKLEY. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the bill as it now stands the words on page 2,

line 11, after the word "cases," the words "from and after the passage of this act."

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it not be as well to insert the provision that only where the allotment has been withheld?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to make the language he has just stated a part of the bill.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Reserving the right to object, what is the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. BARKLEY. Page 2, line 11, after the word "cases," insert the words "from and after the passage of this act."

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not think that would add anything to it and I object.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would it not be as well to have it apply only in cases where the allotment has been reserved or withheld? It is not intended to pay double, it is only intended to pay where the money has been withheld out of the soldier's pay, and yet here is a direction on the part of Congress to pay in cases where the money has been paid back to the soldier.

Mr. BARKLEY. That might carry the implication that the War Department would pay back only that which has been withheld and the intent is to resume these payments from month to month in the future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that would add anything and I therefore object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to make the proposition that the Clerk will read a part of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add as a new section the following:

"Provided, however, That whenever the commissioner shall by further investigation or reinvestigation modify the existing award, no reimbursement from the person receiving an allowance shall be required for allotments and allowances already paid nor shall any deductions be made from allotments and allowances to be paid in the future for any change in award made in previous allotments and allowances."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire whether under the phraseology of the amendment just offered it would not legalize the payments made under fraudulent representations. There have been called to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations by the Bureau of War Risk Insurance numerous instances where persons have perpetrated fraud on the Government in receiving these allowances. By this phraseology you would prevent the Government from obtaining money back which has been unlawfully paid, and for that reason I object.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold it for a moment?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. DOREMUS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer the following amendment:

In line 14, page 2, after the word "cases," insert the word "only."

I understand the gentleman from Virginia is willing to accept that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to having the word "only" inserted?

Mr. MANN. Let it be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DEMPSEY offers the following amendment: Page 2, line 14, after the word "cases," insert the word "only."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman to tell us what that means. I am not always able to catch what the insertion of a negative means at first blush.

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has raised an objection that under this bill there might possibly be payments made of arrearages where the arrearages had not been deducted from the soldier's pay. To make it clear that the payment of arrearages shall be made only where they have been actually deducted, I put in the word "only," which, it seems to me, more clearly confines it to the cases contemplated, which are those where the arrearages have been actually deducted.

Mr. MANN. But the bill apparently only authorizes payment where the amount has been reserved.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I think myself that the bill is plain without the insertion.

Mr. MANN. The most dangerous thing I know of where you have a matter that is fairly clear is to insert a negative. I do

not myself deem that it is necessary. There is a constant query about the meaning of double negatives. Most people who use them do not mean an affirmative, yet they say that it constitutes an affirmative.

Mr. DEMPSEY. I agree with the gentleman. I think the language is plain without the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Then I shall object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia to suspend the rules and pass the bill as amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman have any objection to modifying his motion so as to strike out the whereases?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the whereases in this case recite a state of facts which makes it abundantly clear to anyone why the bill is necessary.

Mr. STAFFORD. The whereases should be a part of the report, but not a part of the permanent statutes of the country.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill, the amendments being a part of it.

The question was taken; and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

INVESTIGATION OF LIGNITE COAL.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, as amended by the Committee on Mines and Mining of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman from Arkansas moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make experiments and investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals to determine the commercial and economic practicability of their utilization in producing fuel oil, gasoline substitutes, ammonia, tar, solid fuels, gas for power, and other purposes; and there is hereby appropriated, out of the funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$100,000, or so much thereof as may be needed, to conduct such experiments and investigations, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and including supplies, equipment, expenses of traveling and subsistence, and for every other expense incident to this work.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell or otherwise dispose of any property, plant, or machinery purchased or acquired under the provisions of this act, as soon as the experiments and investigations hereby authorized have been concluded, and report the results of such experiments and investigations to Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin 20 minutes.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, the House will recall that this proposition was discussed very fully on another bill a few weeks or a couple of months ago, when a similar item was included in a bill which passed the Senate and which subsequently was abandoned in the Senate—one of the war bills. The bill as it passed the Senate included peat, and one of the House amendments is to cut out peat. The bill as it passed the Senate provided \$150,000 as a fund. The House amendment cut the fund down to \$100,000. In addition to that, the House committee proposed an amendment as a new section, section 2:

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to sell or otherwise dispose of any property, plant, or machinery purchased or acquired under the provisions of this act as soon as the experiments and investigations hereby authorized have been concluded, and report the results of such experiments and investigations to Congress.

Now, broadly speaking, the object of the bill is simply to do this: To enable the Department of the Interior to conduct certain experiments, or, rather, to demonstrate by the establishment of plants that which laboratory experiments have already demonstrated, the feasibility of developing the lignite coal deposits of this country which constitute one-third of the coal deposits of the United States. There are something like 7,000,000,000 tons estimated in Alaska alone of lignite. There is a great deal more of these lignite deposits upon Government land that still remains as part of the public domain. Now, as I said, the laboratory experiments which have been conducted have all demonstrated the feasibility of the use of these lignites not only as fuel but in the carbonizing of lignite to develop oils and other matters contained in them which have a high commercial value. Now, some objection was offered once before on this proposition on the ground that it was a paternalistic proposition, but it

is just the contrary. The object of this bill is to demonstrate the commercial practicability so that private enterprise will be induced, as it is in other countries, to take up the lignite deposits of our country. Now, the question may be asked why, if other countries have developed the commercial operations by which their lignite deposits are utilized in a practical commercial way, we can not benefit by their experiments and use the processes which they have developed. The reason for it is this: The lignite deposits of this country are in a different state of development from those in Germany, in Canada, and in other countries where they have developed practical processes. And you understand lignite is just a condition of development of coal from the original state; it has not yet reached the highly developed state which produces bituminous or anthracite coal. Now, in Germany their lignite had proceeded to a natural development to an extent that is different from the lignite of the United States. They found by laboratory experiment that it was a commercial and practical proposition, and the Government expended money to demonstrate it to the commercial interests of Germany, and the result was to make the status of the lignite of that country for fuel; and the development of the gases and the oils of the lignite deposits of Germany constitute the base of the German monopoly for dyestuffs up to the time the war opened. Now, those of you who have read the report will find on page 5 of the report listed under six different subheads the uses and the qualities which are contained in lignite and which we wish to develop to commercial use.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield before going from that?

Mr. WINGO. I will.

Mr. TOWNER. I notice what seems to me rather a singular omission in the language of the bill. It nowhere states where these investigations are to be carried on. They are not limited to the United States and they do not include the Territories, and it seems as if this is left open for the investigation to be carried on anywhere in the world. Of course, I suppose there is no intention or purpose but that under the terms of this bill these operations shall be carried on anywhere except in the United States and its Territories?

Mr. WINGO. The hearings before the committee and the information I have lead me to the conclusion, perhaps, that they will establish one plant in one of the Dakotas—North Dakota. Now, the question raised had not occurred to me before, and I will frankly state I do not think there is any intention to go outside of the United States, unless it is necessary for the investigators for the purpose of comparison to go into Canada, the Saskatchewan district, where they conduct similar work.

Mr. TOWNER. Of course, I suppose the principal lignite deposits that are likely to be beneficial are in Alaska?

Mr. WINGO. No; the gentleman is mistaken there. I should think—

Mr. TOWNER. The Matanuska fields or the lignite fields south of Fairbanks are—

Mr. WINGO. There are great deposits in Alaska.

Mr. TOWNER. The largest lignite fields in the world?

Mr. WINGO. They are the largest individual deposits. Take the deposits of the West and Southwest together, I think possibly they outrank in volume any known deposits of Alaska, although Alaska has the largest single deposit of lignite in the world.

Mr. TOWNER. I want to ask the gentleman another question. Of course, there is a very great deal of difference with regard to the different lignite coals. It does not mean an absolute uniform and valuable fuel producer. There are various degrees of lignite just as there are of bituminous coal and of varying value. Is it the purpose of this bill to allow investigation to be made of various fields and reports to be made regarding their comparative value?

Mr. WINGO. No; I will state to the gentleman, if the gentleman will pardon my interrupting, I have only a few minutes, I promised to yield some of my time—and I would like to be notified when I have used 10 minutes—I will say this to the gentleman. The object we are seeking to do is this, because we have practically located these different lignite fields.

But the object of this is to follow up the laboratory experiments and by putting in a small plant demonstrate from a commercial standpoint the feasibility and the practicability as a profit-making proposition of the utilization of these lignite deposits. That is the object, and the sole object.

Mr. TOWNER. Does not the gentleman think that the amount, \$100,000, for that purpose is somewhat large?

Mr. WINGO. No; I think not.

Mr. TOWNER. If it is merely the object by chemical experiment to determine the value of lignite for the purpose of using it, it seems to me that is a large amount.

Mr. WINGO. I do not think you could test out the plants for \$100,000. I think that amount is too small. I think it should be \$150,000.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has used nine minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, so that we may have further information concerning this bill, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota before I speak in opposition to it.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill proposing an appropriation of a hundred thousand dollars to be used for experiments and investigations to be carried on by the Bureau of Mines for the purpose of determining and demonstrating the feasibility and commercial practicability of carbonizing and briquetting lignite coal. This Senate bill as amended by the Committee on Mines and Mining is substantially the same as the bill H. R. 12192, which I introduced in the House on this subject and on which bill hearings were held before a subcommittee of the Committee on Mines and Mining on June 7 of this year. During the past 15 years there have been carried on in the Northwest, and in the State of North Dakota particularly, a series of experiments and investigations to determine the commercial and economic practicability of using lignite coal and its by-products. During that time there has been a great deal of private capital put into different plants constructed for briquetting lignite coal on a commercial basis. In practically every case so far the investments in these briquetting plants have been commercial failures. For the most part the men who ventured in this work of the briquetting of lignite coal and the manufacture of by-products from the briquetting process did not have either sufficient capital or information on the subject of briquetting lignite to carry on the work to a final and commercial success.

The Bureau of Mines now represents that it can with this appropriation demonstrate to the commercial world that the briquetting of lignite coal and the use at the same time of the by-products of this coal are practical and feasible from a commercial point of view. The bureau intends to use this money in cooperation with some private plant that has already been established either in North Dakota, Colorado, or Texas.

Let me again call your attention, gentlemen of the House, to the immediate and tremendous importance of developing this great natural resource of our country—lignite coal. It is estimated that in the United States there is more than a trillion tons of lignite coal; more than one-third of all the coal in the United States and Alaska is lignite coal. Let me particularly mention just one feature of the possibilities in the development of this low-grade coal. Investigations that have already been made show that as a by-product from a ton of lignite coal there can be secured about 4 gallons of light oils that can be used in internal-combustion engines. This means that the light oils from lignite coal, and that can be secured from it in briquetting processes, are sufficient to meet the needs of the United States for 150 years, whereas the known or estimated amount of gasoline that can be secured from the petroleum fields of the country will only meet the demands of the United States for about the next 25 years. That is one important feature of this work that will be more fully presented to the country by the experiments and investigation to be carried on under this proposed appropriation.

Another great feature is the transportation problem. To-day there is being shipped from Ohio and from other distant fields more than 7,000,000 tons of bituminous coal to the State of Minnesota.

If this lignite coal industry is developed, if the way is pointed out by the United States for private enterprise to engage in this industry, as I believe it should be, instead of transporting coal 1,500 or 2,000 miles into Minnesota it will be brought down there from the great coal fields of North Dakota, which are distant only a few hundred miles. That alone will mean a great economic saving in transportation. It will also allow of needed conservation of coal in Indiana, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, where the coal fields are being rapidly exhausted. To-day throughout North Dakota there can be seen fields of this coal varying in depths from 20 to 40 feet. One of the principal items in any after-war program for progressive development in this country should be the development and expansion of the use of lignite coal and its by-products. Up in Canada they have recently appropriated \$400,000 to develop the use of lignite coal there. Have we not every reason to do more to develop the use of this product in the United States.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON. Certainly.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. NORTON. I want to add that I believe that as a conservation measure that this is one—

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota two minutes.

Mr. NORTON. That this is one of the most important measures that have come before this great Congress, which has had so many great measures before it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. NORTON. I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What I am trying to get at is, Is there machinery at present under the Bureau of Mines by which this investigation can be made?

Mr. NORTON. The bureau has practically all the machinery that is needed. It can secure machinery for this purpose, or nearly all it will need, I know, in my State.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Have they made any of these tests? Has any bureau of the Government made any of these tests so that information is available?

Mr. NORTON. Yes; test experiments and investigation have been made in the laboratory and field work for a number of years.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Why is it necessary to make this large expenditure at this time for this investigation? Perhaps I did not notice your argument closely enough, but in a few words I would like to have you explain why it is necessary to appropriate this sum now?

Mr. NORTON. The bureau estimates that it will need this amount to establish a briquetting plant for the manufacture of lignite briquettes and by-products. Through the establishment of such a plant and its successful operation the bureau promises that it will demonstrate to the commercial world that it is practical to put upon the market at a profit these briquettes and the by-products of lignite coal given off in the manufacture of the briquettes, these by-products being light oils, tars, and gas.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman have any idea of where the department expects to locate this plant?

Mr. NORTON. I have no definite idea. I think they will locate the plant, although they have not so stated, either at Hebron, N. Dak., in connection with the Bureau of Mines station of the State of North Dakota, or at Minot, N. Dak., where there is a private briquetting plant at the present time, in which a large amount of money has been invested.

Mr. LOBECK. The lignite fields extend into Wyoming.

Mr. NORTON. They extend from Canada down through the Dakotas and into Colorado and into Texas. There are some very large fields in Texas.

Mr. LOBECK. I have seen 30 or 40 foot veins in Wyoming.

Mr. NORTON. Along the Missouri River one can see for miles many coal seams or veins having a thickness of 20 to 40 feet. It would be very unwise statesmanship to fail at this time to have the Federal Government take action such as proposed in this bill for the development and use of these great coal fields.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 13 minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, here we have an example of the Government going wild in Government ownership. I contend that with the authority the Bureau of Mines now possesses, similar to the authority possessed by the Bureau of Standards, of making laboratory tests to determine the practicability of these various by-products of lignite coals, it is unwise as now proposed by this bill that the Government should go into the business of establishing a commercial plant. Originally they sought \$150,000, and now \$100,000 is sought by this ambitious Bureau of Mines. If it were for the purpose of merely laboratory work, I would not rise here to oppose it, but when the Government for the first time in its history is attempting to establish a commercial plant to demonstrate to the country at large whether it is economical, practical, and profitable to sell these by-products, I say in these piping times of peace we should call a halt. Perhaps to the gentlemen who compose the Bureau of Mines \$100,000 is not much, but hundreds of thousands of dollars run into millions. They admit that investigations that have been made show that lignite can be made into briquettes; investigations show that oil can be extracted from lignite. Yet the report admits that the one purpose of this appropriation is for the Government to establish a commercial plant to determine whether it is commercially feasible. Section 2 embodies that idea of the purpose and provides that as soon as the plant is established and it is shown that the commercial project is a failure then authority is granted to them to dispose of the plant.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Not just at this time. In the estimate—and, of course, I know, because I, too, have had experience of

some time in this House with bureau chiefs and know that they are inclined to expand their activities—in this estimate of \$100,000 they want \$10,000 for a building for a commercial laboratory. Of course \$10,000, when we are going to appropriate \$100,000, is not much. Then they want \$10,000 additional for a tar still, tar being a by-product of lignite. Then they want \$19,000 for salaries of experts, and all manner of estimates are provided for, including carbonizing ovens, a by-product, \$25,000.

It is not necessary for the Government by experiment to spend \$25,000 for the establishment of carbonizing ovens. They can go to any industrial center of the country where they are extracting by-products from soft coal and manufacturing coke, and they will see there the processes of extraction without the Government wasting \$25,000 in that particular.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman talking about carbonizing lignites now? What has the coke proposition to do with it?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is akin. This process, as the gentleman himself has admitted, has been demonstrated to be practical in Germany, and I am informed also in France. Yet you want the Government now, in these times when we need money so badly, to establish a plant out in North Dakota and Alaska or somewhere else.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. I am interested in the discussion of the coke activities of the Bureau of Mines.

Mr. STAFFORD. I did not say anything about the coke activities of the Bureau of Mines at all. I said anybody acquainted with the commercial and industrial activity in the manufacture of coke would know that it is not necessary for the Government to establish carbonizing ovens to obtain a knowledge of that product.

Mr. WINGO. That may be true, but the items that the gentleman is reading will come up for appropriation in Pennsylvania and Illinois and possibly Arkansas. But none of it has to do with lignites.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman seems to be all wise about this subject when he says it has not anything to do with lignite. I will read the estimate. It says, "Lignite investigations, Bureau of Mines, \$100,000."

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman read about the coke ovens.

Mr. STAFFORD. I decline to yield further, because I can not afford to have all the time taken up by the gentleman in attempting to give information that he does not have. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury says that this is for lignite investigations of the Bureau of Mines, "for investigations of lignites, to determine the commercial and economic practicability of their utilization in producing smokeless fuels for household and industrial uses, gas for domestic and power purposes, nitrogen products for refrigerating or fertilizing purposes, fuel oils for furnaces and internal-combustion engines, and so forth, creosoting oils, benzene, toluene, and other materials required in the manufacture of dyestuffs and explosives and related chemical products, including personal services in the District of Columbia and in the field, but not exceeding 20 per cent to be expended for such services in the District of Columbia, \$100,000."

In specifying the expenditure of that \$100,000 the Secretary of the Treasury has enumerated how that money is to be expended, and we find in the way of equipment, carbonizing ovens, a by-product, \$25,000 is estimated; and yet the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO] has the temerity to rise here when he reports the bill, in a report covering many pages—10 pages—and say this \$25,000 is not for the purpose of experimentation, so far as lignites are concerned. I know there are lignite deposits down in Arkansas, and I know there are lignite deposits up in North Dakota, and I know that there are some in Alaska and in Texas, and I am not surprised that the Representatives of those States are coming here and trying to reach their hands into the Treasury to get \$100,000 for the beginning of an industrial and commercial establishment. I say we should enter a protest here and now at this time against this extravagant policy of going into the business of establishing private plants to determine whether it is commercially and industrially advantageous to extract these various by-products from lignite coal.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves four minutes and a half.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] three minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. DENISON. Gentlemen of the House, I do not think the fears of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] are well founded. Section 2 was placed in the bill by the House com-

mittee in order to meet the situation he suggested. The purpose of this act is not to establish a commercial plant, but to demonstrate to the commercial world that this lignite can be utilized. If the lignite that is now known to be available in this country can be briquetted and made into a commercial fuel, the fuel supply of the country will be increased by a third. It can not be successfully briquetted unless the valuable by-products are reclaimed and utilized. The by-products themselves are very valuable and very much needed. Now, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the Bureau of Mines to conduct experiments for the purpose of demonstrating that by saving and utilizing the by-products lignite can be made into a cheap but valuable fuel coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman read the report?

Mr. DENISON. Oh, I am a member of the committee, and was present during the consideration of the bill, and know all about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was stated that that was the purpose, to establish a commercial plant.

Mr. DENISON. It is only for the purpose of establishing a plant to develop the by-products, in order to demonstrate to the business interests of the country that this lignite can be utilized commercially. Now, the Committee on Mines and Mining, I think at my own suggestion, put this section 2 into the bill in order to anticipate and avoid the suggestion that the gentleman from Wisconsin has made, that this is a Government ownership experiment. This second section of the bill makes it mandatory upon the Bureau of Mines, after they have gone ahead and made their experiments and developed the lignite as far as they can under the appropriation, to dispose of any plant or other property that they may acquire in making the demonstration and make a report of their experiments and demonstrations to the Congress. So that this money will be taken by the Bureau of Mines and used to demonstrate to private individuals and to the business interests of the country whether or not lignite can be developed and made a merchantable product. In order to do that you have got to develop the by-products. The Bureau of Mines has not now the necessary machinery or funds to do that. They told the committee that when lignite is properly briquetted it becomes a clean fuel, with the same heat value as anthracite coal.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Can the gentleman cite any instance where the Government has undertaken a similar work in the development of any other natural resource?

Mr. DENISON. I am not able to do so, because I am not familiar with all the activities of the Government. Inasmuch as there is an immense quantity of this lignite in this country, which is being used in Germany and other countries, the committee thought it was at least worth the attention of the Government, and that this amount of money might well be used to demonstrate whether or not this product can be used commercially in this country. That is the reason why we approved of the bill. I think section 2 protects the Government and the people against any effort on the part of the Bureau of Mines, or anyone connected with the bureau, to try to put the Government into the business, because after the bureau has made the experiment and demonstration the bill compels the bureau to dispose of the plant and go out of the business. If the Government can demonstrate to the business interests of the country that lignite can be economically made into a good commercial fuel, we will have made a valuable investment in expending the amount authorized in this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Arkansas has nine minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin four and a half minutes.

Mr. WINGO. I suggest to the gentleman that he use his time now.

Mr. STAFFORD. There will be only one speech. Will there be only one on the other side?

Mr. WINGO. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HAMLIN].

Mr. HAMLIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to say only just a word or two in explanation of this bill. I think perhaps I ought to say that in all my experience here I have never approached the study of a proposition with as little preconceived opinion or anything that might influence or prejudice me for or against a proposition as I have the study of this bill. When the matter came up I hardly knew that there was such a thing as lignite. I knew absolutely nothing about it. There is none of it anywhere in my section of the country that I know of, and therefore I was prepared to study the question with an open mind. I have tried to give this matter pretty careful investigation and study. I believe that it is a question possessing a great deal of merit from many standpoints. Un-

questionably there is nothing in the apprehension voiced by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD]. There was no idea or intention on the part of the Committee on Mines and Mining to have the Government go into anything that would savor of Government ownership.

Briefly this state of facts exists: North Dakota, through her university, has been making some experiments in the treatment of the lignites and has equipped a kind of plant for carrying on that work. Now, as I understand, the Government is proposing to join with them in this work of demonstrating the feasibility and practicability of the treatment of lignite in a commercial way. Now, the proposition as I understand it is, if this small appropriation is made, for the Government to join with the authorities of North Dakota and perhaps some other places in the country and erect a plant, putting in the necessary ovens and machinery to demonstrate physically the feasibility of treating these lignites in such a way as to induce private capital to take up the work on a large and commercial scale.

The Bureau of Mines believes that the by-products can be made to pay more than the expense of the treatment of coals. After separating the by-products it is the intention to briquette the carbon. Then you will have a fuel that is about equivalent to anthracite in heating units. It was testified before the committee that the experiments conducted so far have convinced the experts that after you have extracted the by-products, the oils, the tars, gases, and so forth, all of which are valuable and are badly needed in this country, the fuel part, the carbon, can be briquetted and placed on board the cars at \$4.50 a ton, and having a heating capacity equivalent to that of anthracite. If that can be done, that thing alone will be worth many millions of dollars to the people throughout the United States.

But aside from that, we all recall that in the beginning of this war we were told that we could not buy clothing of as good quality as we bought before, because of our inability to manufacture the dyes that would hold their color, and so forth, and that because these things had come from Germany heretofore and we were to be deprived of them, we were forced to use inferior stuff in the way of clothing. I believe that great benefits will come from this horrible war just closing, and I believe that one of those benefits arises from the fact that it has been necessary for us to develop the resources of our own country. This is one step in that progress. If the experiment which the Government is now proposing by this bill will have the effect, as we believe that it will, of demonstrating that we have in this country the materials for the much-needed dyes used in manufacturing, that alone will compensate for the little money herein authorized and for all the time and energy expended in the experiment. Then add to that the tons of first-class fuel which can be added, at low prices we hope, to the fuel supply of the country, and the benefit will be almost incalculable.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAMLIN. For a question; yes.

Mr. MANN. I see there is nothing in this bill that says anything about briquetting. Is it the intention or is there any authorization for the Bureau of Mines, if it conducts these experiments, to sell any of the products of the experiments?

Mr. HAMLIN. I think not. That will not be the prime purpose of the Bureau of Mines. They will not go into it for the primary purpose of selling the products.

Mr. MANN. What will they do with them?

Mr. HAMLIN. I was going to say, if this becomes a law, they will put in a plant, as I understand, in conjunction with one partially erected.

Mr. MANN. They have sent in an estimate for a plant but not in conjunction with any other.

Mr. NORTON. If the gentleman will allow me, I will say that it is the intention of the bureau to sell the briquettes that they manufacture.

Mr. HAMLIN. I was going to further answer the gentleman that in the conduct of these experiments, not for the purpose of selling anything to make money, but in conducting these experiments, they will make some briquettes and will likely sell the briquettes that they make. But it is not the purpose of the bill to have the Government manufacture briquettes for sale. The purpose is to demonstrate to the business interests of the country the practicability and the feasibility of private capital going into the business on a large commercial scale.

Mr. MANN. I understand that from the gentleman's statement, and I would not interrupt him until he had passed that point. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell or otherwise dispose of any property, plant, or machinery purchased or acquired under the provisions of the act as soon as the experiment and investigation have been concluded. Would not that apparently forbid them to sell any of these products?

Mr. HAMLIN. It is perhaps possible that section 2 ought to have gone further and provided for the sale of any products that they have on hand when they cease investigation.

Mr. DENISON. I will suggest that the Government has ample use for all briquettes that are manufactured.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I ask the gentleman from Arkansas if there will be only one speech in conclusion on that side?

Mr. WINGO. I do not know—

Mr. STAFFORD. It is customary to have the opposition close when only one speech is to be made on the other side.

Mr. WINGO. Is the gentleman addressing his remarks to me? I know what is customary, and if the gentleman had understood me he would understand the situation.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman from Arkansas would be courteous enough to comply with the usual custom.

Mr. WINGO. I do not require any instructions from the gentleman from Milwaukee as to courtesy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). Gentlemen are out of order.

Mr. WINGO. I call the gentleman to order, and want to say that I require no lesson in courtesy from the gentleman from Milwaukee.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not appreciate the courteous remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill is the launching of a Government plant into the manufacture of by-products of lignite, and there is no escape from that conclusion in reading the bill. It is not limited in its expenditure to \$100,000, but when once the bill is passed authorizations for unlimited amounts can be presented to the Appropriations Committee. No one need delude himself that they are going to conclude these investigations in a short time. That is not what the Bureau of Mines does. They want to have a plant established and go into the business of making the by-products of lignite. They wish to establish this plant somewhere and then come to Congress for increased appropriations. This is purely a Government-ownership proposition. I am not surprised that it emanated from North Dakota, and I am not surprised that North Dakota is launching into the project, because North Dakota has the reputation for that character of experiment and investigation. If North Dakota wants to do it, let it take the responsibility. The Congress of the United States ought not at the present time to undertake this character of work. It is purely a proposition of Government ownership. There is no limit to the amount of money that may be expended. It is true that only \$100,000 is appropriated, but, as the gentleman from Illinois has explained, there is no authority for the disposition of the products. There is authority to dispose of them after the investigation has been concluded. But when will the experiment be concluded? If the Bureau of Mines did not have the authority to investigate this subject, I would not rise in opposition to a laboratory investigation. This is something more. It is the first time in the history of the Government that a bureau has called upon the National Government to go into the manufacturing business. Where will the limit be to that character of governmental activity?

Mr. STEENERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. STEENERSON. I notice in line 5 the bill provides for the investigations of coal and peat.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman had been here he would know that the bill now is limited to lignite, under the amendment of the committee. If we go into the investigation of lignite coal why not have the Government go into every character of mineral deposit and determine whether it is advisable to commercially manufacture its by-products? If you are in favor of Government ownership, if you are in favor of something that is chimerical, if you are in favor of something that has not been established successfully, this is a good way to show the abuses and waste that follow from Government ownership.

Again I wish to emphasize that this is no time to enter upon such an investigation. I have no doubt that the Bureau of Mines can expend the money, but at the end the plant will be junked and sold for a mere pittance, without any resulting gain to the industrial and commercial activity of the country.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I used to be one of those men who saw ghosts every time anything was presented to me that I did not know anything about. As a matter of fact, there is no Government ownership in this matter. By any far-fetched imagination there could not be; but, in anticipation of some such objection that might be offered by those who do not know anything about it, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DENISON] offered an amendment, which the committee accepted, which is section No. 2, that absolutely precludes any possibility of the Government going into business. This bill is simple in its terms. The wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein.

It is simply a bill to establish a plant that will demonstrate from a commercial standpoint the feasibility of developing and utilizing this great natural resource of the United States. There is not a bit of Government ownership in it. If we wanted to bring in a Government-ownership bill we would bring in a bill that would authorize the establishment of briquetting plants and other activities on the public domain, because there are millions of tons of this lignite in the public lands; but the committee which reported this is composed of men who are opposed to Government activities of this kind, except where it is absolutely necessary to conserve or develop our natural resources and build up the industrial and economic strength of the Nation, and for that reason we come in here and ask for a miserable pittance of \$100,000 to undertake to develop one of the great natural resources of the United States, so as to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the commercial interests of the country that it would be a feasible proposition for them to come in and do like the commercial interests of other countries have done, namely, utilize the great product that is worth so much to our country.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I regret I can not yield; I have only four minutes. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] undertakes to say and did say boldly that this is a selfish proposition by a few Members to get a few thousand dollars spent in Arkansas, Texas, and Dakota. If the gentleman had known anything about the bill, he would have known that there is not a ton of lignite in my district; he would have known that not a dollar of this will be expended in my district nor in the district of any member of the committee; and he would have known where it is to be expended. If the gentleman had information about the matter, he would know that I have large coal fields in my district, and that if I were as selfish and as narrow in voting on legislation of this kind as the gentleman indicates that he is, I would oppose this, because the selfish interests of my district might be against the development of this great natural resource. Develop the lignite of Texas and they will not use as much coal from my district. Develop the lignites of North Dakota and of the West and they will not use so much coal from the gentlemen's districts, members of the committee, as they might otherwise use; but the members of this committee had no idea of selfishness but were moved solely by a desire to develop this great resource and thereby increase the economic strength of the Nation. The members of the committee found this great natural product in this country, one-third of the coal, and found that not only would its development add to the fuel and power of the country but that there is a possibility of breaking the monopoly of Germany in dyestuffs by developing and utilizing the oil that is found in these deposits. One hundred thousand dollars?

Oh, yes; "in these piping times of peace," as the gentleman says, we ought not to expend money for such purposes. Yet the gentleman has time and again voted for bills that expended millions on Government activities not worth one-half as much to the economic strength of the Nation, and he will do so again. You spend millions to build railroads in Alaska and millions to take care of private contractors, millions for irrigation, millions for public buildings, millions in increasing salaries, millions for useless positions, but, forsooth, when a committee comes in here with no selfish interests to serve, with none of them having a selfish interest in that the money is to be expended in their districts, and asks you to spend \$100,000 to develop and utilize one-third of the coal deposits of the United States by putting the use of lignite on a paying commercial basis, like it is in other countries, the gentleman, with an assumed air of superiority, and as the self-appointed mentor of the House, raises the bugaboo of Government ownership. Such a contention is absurd, and readily appears so by even a cursory reading of the bill.

I have no interest in the bill other than the interest all have who have vision and intelligence sufficient to see the wisdom of developing the natural resources of the country. Of course, those who are lacking in constructive thought, and who limit their activities to objecting to everything not proposed by themselves, or does not give a direct benefit to their districts, can be expected to oppose measures of this kind. The committee believed this expenditure wise and that it would bring a great return to the country, and directed me to report it, which I have done. I repeat, I have no special interest in the bill, nor has my district, but I support it because I believe it is a wise piece of constructive legislation that will promote the public welfare. It will, I think, ultimately mean a saving of \$15,000,000 annually to the State of Texas alone, and many more millions to the other Western States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. All time has expired. The question is

on the motion of the gentleman from Arkansas to suspend the rules and pass the bill as read with the committee amendments.

The question was taken, and on a division, at the suggestion of the Chair, there were—ayes 38, noes 20.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, on this I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll; and there were—yeas 182, nays 85, answered "present" 4, not voting 160, as follows:

YEAS—182.

Alexander	Egan	Jones	Ramseyer
Anderson	Eagle	Kehoe	Randall
Baer	Edmonds	Kelly, Pa.	Rankin
Barkley	Elston	King	Rayburn
Barnhart	Esch	Kinkaid	Romjue
Beakes	Evans	Knutson	Rubey
Bell	Fess	La Follette	Rucker
Benson	Fields	La Guardia	Sanders, La.
Beublin	Fisher	Lampert	Schall
Bland, Va.	Flood	Larsen	Scott, Mich.
Blanton	Focht	Lea, Cal.	Shallenberger
Booher	Fordney	Leshner	Siegel
Brodbeck	Foss	Linthicum	Sims
Buchanan	Foster	Little	Sinnot
Burnett	French	Littlepage	Sloan
Byrnes, S. C.	Gallagher	Lobeck	Small
Byrnes, Tenn.	Gandy	Loneragan	Smith, Idaho
Caldwell	Gard	Lundeen	Smith, T. F.
Candler, Miss.	Garner	McAndrews	Steagall
Cantrill	Garrett, Tenn.	McCulloch	Steenerson
Carlin	Glynn	McKinley	Stephens, Miss.
Cary	Goodwin, N. C.	Magee	Stephens, Nebr.
Cleary	Good	Mann	Stevenson
Coady	Goodwin, Ark.	Mansfield	Sumners
Collier	Gordon	Mapes	Taylor, Ark.
Connally, Tex.	Gray, Ala.	Martin	Taylor, Colo.
Copley	Griest	Mason	Tillman
Crago	Hadley	Mays	Timberlake
Cramton	Hamlin	Miller, Wash.	Voigt
Crisp	Hardy	Mondell	Walton
Crosser	Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Watson, Va.
Curry, Cal.	Hastings	Nelson, A. P.	Weaver
Darrow	Hawley	Nolan	Welling
Davis	Hayden	Norton	Welty
Dempsey	Heflin	Oldfield	Whaley
Denison	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Wheeler
Dent	Hilliard	Olney	White, Ohio
Denton	Holland	Osborne	Williams
Dickinson	Houston	Overstreet	Wilson, La.
Dill	Huddleston	Phelan	Wilson, Tex.
Dillon	Hull, Iowa	Platt	Wingo
Dixon	Hull, Tenn.	Polk	Wise
Dominick	Humphreys	Porter	Wright
Doollittle	Igoe	Pou	Young, Tex.
Dorcemus	Jacoway	Rainey, J. W.	
Doughton	James	Raker	

NAYS—85.

Almon	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Snell
Anthony	Gillett	McKeown	Snook
Aswell	Gould	Merritt	Snyder
Ayres	Graham, Ill.	Montague	Stafford
Bacharach	Green, Iowa	Moon	Strong
Bankhead	Greene, Mass.	Moore, Pa.	Sweet
Birch	Greene, Vt.	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Blackmon	Hamilton, Mich.	Mott	Thompson
Bland, Ind.	Haskell	Paige	Tilson
Burroughs	Herzey	Parker, N. J.	Treadway
Campbell, Kans.	Hicks	Peters	Vare
Cannon	Hollingsworth	Powers	Vestal
Clark, Pa.	Johnson, Wash.	Purnell	Ward
Classon	Juul	Ramsey	Wason
Dale	Kearns	Rogers	Watson, Pa.
Dallinger	Kennedy, Iowa	Rose	White, Me.
Dies	Kincheloe	Rouse	Winslow
Dowell	Kraus	Rowe	Woodyard
Drukker	Langley	Sanders, Ind.	Zihlman
Elliot	London	Sanford	
Ellsworth	Lufkin	Sells	
Farr	McFadden	Shouse	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—4.

Browning	Chandler, Okla.	Claypool	Walsh
----------	-----------------	----------	-------

NOT VOTING—160.

Ashbrook	Cooper, W. Va.	Fairfield	Heaton
Austin	Cooper, Wis.	Ferris	Heintz
Black	Costello	Flynn	Helm
Borland	Cox	Francis	Helvering
Bowers	Currie, Mich.	Frear	Hood
Brand	Davey	Freeman	Howard
Britten	Decker	Fuller, Mass.	Husted
Browne	Delaney	Gallivan	Hutchinson
Brumbaugh	Dewalt	Garland	Ireland
Butler	Donovan	Garrett, Tex.	Johnson, Ky.
Campbell, Pa.	Doolling	Goodall	Johnson, S. Dak.
Caraway	Drane	Graham, Pa.	Kahn
Carew	Dunn	Gray, N. J.	Keating
Carter, Mass.	Dupré	Gregg	Kelley, Mich.
Carter, Okla.	Dyer	Griffin	Kennedy, R. I.
Chandler, N. Y.	Emerson	Hamill	Kettner
Church	Essen	Hamilton, N. Y.	Key, Ohio
Clark, Fla.	Estopinal	Harrison, Miss.	Kless, Pa.
Connelly, Kans.	Fairchild, B. L.	Haugen	Kitchin
Cooper, Ohio	Fairchild, G. W.	Hayes	Kreider

Lazaro	Nichols, Mich.	Russell	Sullivan
Lee, Ga.	Oliver, N. Y.	Sabath	Swift
Leibach	O'Shaunessy	Sanders, N. Y.	Switzer
Lever	Overmyer	Saunders, Va.	Tague
Longworth	Padgett	Scott, Iowa	Templeton
Lunn	Park	Scott, Pa.	Thomas
McArthur	Parker, N. Y.	Scully	Tinkham
McClintie	Pratt	Sears	Towner
McCormick	Price	Shackleford	Van Dyke
McLaughlin, Mich.	Quin	Sherley	Venable
McLaughlin, Pa.	Ragsdale	Sherwood	Vinson
McLemore	Rainey, H. T.	Sisson	Volstead
Madden	Reavis	Slayden	Waldow
Maher	Reed	Slomp	Walker
Miller, Minn.	Riordan	Smith, Mich.	Watkins
Morin	Robbins	Smith, C. E.	Webb
Mudd	Roberts	Stedman	Wilson, Ill.
Neely	Robinson	Steele	Wood, Ind.
Nelson, J. M.	Rodenberg	Sterling	Woods, Iowa
Nicholls S. C.	Rowland	Stiness	Young, N. Dak.

So, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BROWNE.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.

Mr. HARRISON with Mr. REAVIS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia with Mr. WALSH.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. BROWNING.

Mr. WATKINS with Mr. REED.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. BOWERS.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma with Mr. BRITTEN.

Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.

Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. COOPER of Ohio.

Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. ROBINSON with Mr. SANDERS of New York.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. THOMAS with Mr. WOOD of Indiana.

Mr. WEBB with Mr. TOWNER.

Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to be recorded present.

I have a pair with my colleague, the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. PADGETT. If I were allowed to vote, I should vote "no."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SAUNDERS. I voted "aye." I desire to withdraw my vote and answer "present."

The name of Mr. WALSH was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A quorum is present, the Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record the tribute of ex-President Taft to the late Col. Roosevelt.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is advised that has already been done to-day. The present occupant of the chair was not here then, but the clerks at the desk advise him that that order has been granted. This is suspension day, and the Speaker directed after the last motion that the Unanimous Consent Calendar be called.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. The rule provides that immediately after the reading of the Journal on days when it is in order to suspend the rules the Speaker is directed to have the Unanimous Consent Calendar called. Business having intervened since the reading of the Journal, is it now in order to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar? Does it require unanimous consent to consider that calendar? I direct the present occupant of the chair to the rule:

On days when it shall be in order to move to suspend the rules the Speaker shall, immediately after the approval of the Journal, direct the Clerk to call the bills which have been for three days upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. Should objection be made to the consideration of any bill so called, it shall immediately be stricken from such calendar; but such bill may be restored to the calendar at the instance of the Member, and if again objected to it shall be immediately stricken from such calendar and shall not thereafter be placed thereon: *Provided*, That the same bill shall not be called twice on the same legislative day.

It has been the policy, as the present occupant of the chair well knows, that the Unanimous Consent Calendar has been first called, and then the Speaker would recognize certain Members

to move to suspend the rules. The rule specifically provides that immediately after the reading of the Journal it shall be in order and the Speaker is directed to have the Unanimous Consent Calendar called. Of course he has authority to suspend the rules and recognize Members for that purpose. Now, having done so, is it not too late to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, this is suspension day. Under the rules the first and third Mondays of each month are suspension days, when it is in order to move a suspension of the rules, and by the unanimous-consent agreement it is Monday, as far as the order of business is concerned. A motion to suspend the rules is in order at any time on those two Mondays of the month—at any time a motion to suspend the rules is in order. Now, the rule provides that on suspension days the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall be called. It says:

Shall, immediately after the approval of the Journal, direct the Clerk to call the bills, etc.

No one will contend that that would prevent the Speaker recognizing some one to ask unanimous consent, as was done this morning, nor is it within the power of the Speaker to abrogate the rule by recognizing some one after the reading of the Journal to ask unanimous consent to do something else, and then say that because he has recognized some one to ask unanimous consent he can not physically direct the Clerk to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar after the reading of the Journal because he has done something else. The Speaker can not suspend a rule of the House in that way. It is the duty of the Speaker to have the Unanimous Consent Calendar called to-day under the rule. It is the privilege of the Speaker to recognize some one to ask unanimous consent to do something, and it is within the power of the Speaker to recognize any Member of the House to-day to move to suspend the rules, but meanwhile, when those things are out of the way, then the Unanimous Consent Calendar automatically is called for under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CRISP). Answering the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD], the Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] correctly answered the inquiry. The Chair was going to answer the gentleman's inquiry before the gentleman from Illinois indicated his desire to express his views to the effect that this being the first Monday it was in order to call the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and the fact that there had been some motions to suspend the rules entertained previously in no wise vitiated the right that the Unanimous Consent Calendar should be called if the House should remain in session. The Clerk will report the first bill.

RESTORATION TO ENTRY OF 80-ROD STRIP RESERVATIONS IN ALASKA.

The first bill in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12210) to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shore of navigable waters in Alaska."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman who reported this bill has to-day been ceremoniously deprived of his seat. I do not know whether the present Delegate from Alaska is acquainted with the present measure and I ask unanimous consent that the bill—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill is so plainly a proper measure and is so much needed by a few people that it ought not to be delayed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. In the last line of the bill there is a reservation that these reserved spaces shall not apply so far as harborage uses are concerned. I would like to inquire if that should not also include wharfage as well as harborage?

Mr. MANN. I do not think it is necessary.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Do you want to pass it without prejudice?

Mr. MANN. It ought to pass the House. The legislation ought to be enacted. Under the law relating to Alaska when a man has taken a homestead claim there must be 80 rods intervening between two homesteads, which is entirely unnecessary, and makes them a long way apart. Then they are restricted as to the area in width, and so forth, when the fact is that these homesteaders who take homesteads for agricultural purposes have to run along a stream to a very large extent. They want length and not width. Now, strange to say, contrary to the belief which I have entertained for many years, they are really developing some agriculture up there. I have learned recently by some reports and from talks, partly with Mr. SULZER, that

they are supplying most of the small agricultural products up there by raising them at home. And this bill will permit these people to obtain homesteads which otherwise will be absolutely impossible and impracticable owing to the nature and location of the land up there suitable for the purpose.

Mr. STAFFORD. The only doubt I had in my mind was as to whether it was feasible to grant to any homesteader more than 160 rods along any navigable stream.

Mr. MANN. But that is the very thing. Now, we reserved rights up there so as to reserve the navigation. But here comes a man wanting to homestead along a stream. He can only get now 160 rods. He can not go very far away from the stream—a narrow valley. He can utilize that ground in raising products. He can not afford to devote his entire time in raising products on a strip 160 rods long and which is only a few rods wide. There is no reason why he should not be permitted to get sufficient arable land in length to make him a homestead and then let somebody else get the land that is next to him. In other words, it was a desire on the part of Congress in the first place, and it was a proper desire, to prevent the monopolization of the lands along all navigable streams. In the main, that has been done, practically, and the Government has selected nearly everything they wanted up there, especially along the shore lines. We did not desire, and the gentleman will remember there were a number of contests in the House, to make it possible for some great monopoly to take the homesteads along the shore line and acquire the harborage rights on the harbors of Alaska. I think that is fully protected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12210) to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shore of navigable waters in Alaska."

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the act of May 14, 1898 (30 Stats. L., p. 409), extending the homestead laws to Alaska, and of the act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stats. L., p. 1028), amendatory thereof, in so far as they reserve from sale and entry a space of at least 80 rods in width between tracts sold or entered under the provisions thereof along the shore of any navigable water, and to provide that no entry shall be allowed extending more than 160 rods along the shore of any navigable water, shall not apply to lands classified and listed by the Secretary of Agriculture for entry under the act of June 11, 1906 (34 Stats., p. 233), and that the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, restore to entry and disposition such reserved spaces as he shall determine are not necessary for harborage uses and purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. RAKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GRANT OF LANDS TO THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10587) granting to the city of San Diego certain lands in the Cleveland National Forest and the Capitan Grande Indian Reservation for dam and reservoir purposes for the conservation of water, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, I understand, is not wanted to be considered now and ought to go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. RAKER. It will not take but a moment.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes; it will.

Mr. RAKER. We do not want to put it at the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 6421) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or who have been totally disabled in the military or naval service of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Let the bill be considered, Mr. Speaker, on the reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6421) to increase the pensions of those who have lost limbs or have been totally disabled in the same in the military or naval service of the United States.

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act all persons on the pension roll, and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty, shall have lost one hand or one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$65 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow, or a leg at or above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones of the arm or leg, or of the elbow or knee joints, or where there is an ankylosis of either of said joints, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$70 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost an arm at the shoulder, or a leg at the hip joint, or so near the shoulder or hip joint, or where the same is in such a condition as to prevent the use of an artificial limb, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the humerus or femur or of the shoulder or hip joint, or where there is ankylosis of either of said joints shall receive a pension at the rate of \$75 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost one hand and one foot, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the arm or leg, or where there is an ankylosis of any of the joints of said arm or leg, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$100 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both hands or both feet, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or joints of either of said arms or legs, or where there is an ankylosis of any of the joints of said arms or legs, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$100 per month; and that all persons who in like manner shall have lost both arms and both legs, or have been totally disabled in the same, or where there has been an excision or resection of any part of the bones or of the joints of either of said arms or legs, shall receive a pension at the rate of \$150 per month: *Provided, however*, That this act shall not be so construed as to reduce any pension under any act, public or private.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will be stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on that bill. I want to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

INCREASING PENSIONS OF ARMY NURSES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7738) to increase the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, under a reservation of an objection, I ask that this bill be read for information.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the rate of pension allowed to Army nurses of the Civil War, whose names have been or shall hereafter be properly placed upon the pension roll under the provisions of existing laws, and otherwise entitled to receive a less rate than herein provided, shall be \$25 per month.

Sec. 2. That this act shall not be construed to repeal or modify the provisions of section 4720, Revised Statutes, United States, as to rates of pension fixed by special act of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire of the gentleman who introduced the bill and reported it as to the number of nurses that this bill will apply to.

Mr. LANGLEY. My information, obtained from the Commissioner of Pensions or the Pension Office, is that there are now only about 145 Army nurses to whom this increase would apply. There were when this bill was introduced something over 200. Nearly all of these Army nurses have battle-field records. A majority of them, I am informed, are in indigent circumstances, and I really think that it was an oversight that they were not included in the Ashbrook bill and the Smoot bill, increasing the pensions of widows. Everybody, I think, will agree that these Army nurses with this record should have been included.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I will.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman advise the House what these Army nurses now get?

Mr. LANGLEY. They get \$12 now. This bill is to increase their pension to \$25 per month.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the Speaker recognize me at this moment to make a motion to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that he is now temporarily occupying the chair, and, carrying out the instructions of the Speaker, he could not entertain a motion now by anybody to suspend the rules. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LANDS OF THE SOUTHERN OREGON CO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8625) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That upon the execution and delivery by the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, of a deed satisfactory to the Attorney General of the United States, reconveying to the United States all the right, title, and interests of the said Southern Oregon Co. in and to the lands situated in the counties of Coos and Douglas, in the State of Oregon, and embraced within the limits of the grant made by the United States to the State of Oregon by the act of March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, and now involved in litigation pending in the Supreme Court of the United States under the style and title "The Southern Oregon Co. v. The United States," the said lands shall again become a part of the public domain, and the United States shall pay to the Southern Oregon Co. the sum of \$232,463.07. The execution and delivery of the aforesaid deed within 30 days from and after the approval of this act shall constitute the acceptance of this act by the said Southern Oregon Co.; and upon the approval of such deed by the Attorney General of the United States the aforesaid suit shall be dismissed and all matters of difference, controversy, and litigation between the United States and the said Southern Oregon Co. arising out of said land grant shall be deemed fully settled, adjusted, and terminated.

Sec. 2. That the taxes accrued and unpaid on the said lands on the date of the delivery of the deed provided for in the preceding section shall be paid by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior as soon as may be after this act becomes effective, and a sum sufficient to make such payment and also to provide for the payment of the said sum of \$232,463.07, as provided for in section 1 of this act, is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Sec. 3. That the said lands shall be classified and disposed of in the manner provided by the act of June 9, 1916 (39 Stat. L., 218), for the classification and disposition of the Oregon and California railroad grant lands: *Provided*, That such persons who, being citizens of the United States, have continuously leased from the said Southern Oregon Co. for a period of not less than 10 years any of said lands classified as agricultural, not exceeding 160 acres to each person, shall be allowed a preference right of six months in which to purchase such lands from the United States by paying therefor the sum of \$2.50 per acre: *Provided further*, That where any of such leased lands have been resided upon, to the same extent and in the same manner as is required under the homestead laws, since the 1st day of December, 1913, by any person duly qualified to enter such lands claiming adversely to such lessee, and who has improved the land and devoted some portion thereof to agricultural use, and who shall have maintained his residence to the date of his application, the claim of such settler and resident shall be superior to that of the lessee, and he shall be allowed the preference right of entry afforded actual settlers by section 5 of the act of June 9, 1916, aforesaid.

Sec. 4. That the title to all money arising out of said lands and now on deposit to await the final outcome of said suit now pending in the Supreme Court, as aforesaid, is hereby vested in the United States, and the United States is subrogated to all the rights and remedies of the obligee or obligees, and especially of Harry E. Laughlin as commissioner, under any contract for the purchase of timber on said lands.

Sec. 5. That all moneys received from or on account of said lands and timber and the timber thereon under the provisions of this act shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States in a separate fund to be designated "The Coos Bay Wagon Road grant fund," which fund shall be disposed of in the following manner: A separate account shall be kept in the General Land Office of the sales of said lands and timber within each of the two counties of Coos and Douglas, and after the proceeds from such sales amount to a sum equal to that applied to pay the accrued taxes in that county and a sum equal to \$2.50 per acre for each acre of such land therein title to which is reverted in the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act, 25 per cent of all other moneys received from said lands shall be paid to the State treasurer of the State of Oregon, to be and become a part of the irreducible school fund of the State; 25 per cent shall be paid to the treasurer of the county in which the lands sold are situated for common schools, roads, highways, bridges, and port districts, to be apportioned by the county courts for the several purposes above mentioned; 40 per cent shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act; and the remainder shall become a part of the general fund in the Treasury of the United States. The payments herein authorized shall be made by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of the Secretary of the Interior, as the fund accumulates in the Treasury: *Provided*, That none of the payments to the State and counties and to the reclamation fund provided for in this section shall be made until the Treasury has been reimbursed in the amount paid to the Southern Oregon Co. and also for all taxes paid pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of this act.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purpose of carrying the provisions of this act into full force and effect; and any person, applicant, purchaser, entryman, or witness who shall swear falsely in any affidavit or proceeding required hereunder or under the regulations issued by the Secretary of the Interior shall be guilty of perjury and liable to the penalties prescribed therefor.

SEC. 7. That the sum of \$50,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to enable the Secretary of the Interior, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture, or otherwise, to complete the classification of the lands as herein provided, which amount shall be immediately available and shall remain available until such classification shall have been completed.

SEC. 8. That this act shall become effective upon its acceptance by the Southern Oregon Co., in the manner provided by the first section hereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I will.

Mr. SINNOTT. If this bill is deferred in its passage until February or March, an additional amount of taxes will accrue to the extent of \$40,000 or \$60,000. This matter has been in the courts for some time. The Attorney General's Office has effected a compromise with the wagon-road company, by which the wagon-road company offers to settle the litigation, receiving just exactly what the courts have held that the wagon-road company is entitled to, and no more. If this bill is further delayed until the next tax-paying time comes around, something like \$40,000 or \$60,000 more of taxes will have to be paid in March, and it is to the interest of the Government that this litigation be settled at once. I hope the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] will not insist on his objection.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, may the bill be again reported?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will again be read.

The bill was again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. I wish to further state, Mr. Speaker, that this is really a bill retaking something like 93,000 acres of land and vesting in the United States Government the title of a wagon-road grant. The bill was drafted by the Attorney General's office and introduced by myself, and the committee modified the bill and changed the allowance to the State from 50 per cent to 25 per cent.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The copy of the bill that I have before me does not show that it has been reported from the committee.

Mr. SINNOTT. It has been reported from the Committee on Public Lands. The gentleman must have the wrong copy.

Mr. MANN. It was reported on June 24, 1918, by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TILLMAN].

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Just a moment, if you please. Is there a unanimous report?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. There is a unanimous report.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, just prior to the close of the last session I asked unanimous consent that this bill be passed over so that further information could be obtained, and later on my former colleague, Senator LENROOT, called upon me and stated that he had given very full consideration to this measure and that it was in line with the bill that had been passed concerning the Oregon and California railroad land grants.

Mr. SINNOTT. Except the allowance to the State is cut in two.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The bill ought to be on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. It is.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the gentleman from Tennessee I might say that I was a member of the subcommittee, consisting of Mr. TILLMAN as chairman and somebody else, and that we reported this bill unanimously to the whole committee. The report was unanimous from the Committee on the Public Lands in favor of this bill.

It occurred to the committee from the evidence that the matter was urgent, and that the Government stood to gain in the transaction; that 93,000 acres of good timber land—most of it good timber land—was granted back to the Government, and altogether the United States was to be the gainer in the passage of the bill. I think, therefore, that there should not be any objection made.

Mr. MANN. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that the bill is on the Union Calendar. While my friend says it was on the House Calendar, it is now on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. I withdraw the objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after the word "terminated" add the following: "Provided, That nothing herein shall be construed to prevent the United States from instituting and maintaining such suits or actions as may be necessary to recover the value of timber or other material heretofore cut or removed from any of said lands without the consent of the Southern Oregon Co."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 6, after the word "accrued" strike out the word "and," and after the word "unpaid" insert the words "and now delinquent."

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a clerical mistake. In line 6 the insertion of the word "now" in the amendment is improper, because it obscures the sense and is really not good grammar. On page 3, line 6, the word "now" should be stricken out of the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman offers to amend the committee amendment by striking out the word "now"?

Mr. SINNOTT. By striking out the word "now."

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Attorney General, in his letter to the chairman of the committee, suggested that it should be made clear whether the Government is to pay only the principal of the taxes or both the principal and the penalties and interest. As I read this amendment, the Government will be obligated to pay the penalties and the interest.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is the way they did upon the Oregon-California railroad grant. The taxes, including penalties and interest, are a valid lien, and I think they should be paid.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, we are helping the county by paying this large sum, running into \$400,000.

Mr. SINNOTT. Well, at the same time you are removing the property from the tax roll.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the amount of the penalties and interest accumulated on the taxes now due on this property?

Mr. SINNOTT. It is stated in the report of the Attorney General, on page 5, that the taxes in Coos County, without penalty and interest, for the years 1909 to 1916 amount to \$233,636.45, while with the penalty and interest these taxes amount to \$366,693.95. The net tax claimed by Douglas County, where the smaller portion of the grant is situated, amounts to \$32,463.55, while the penalty and interest in this county are \$9,699.11, making a total for Douglas County of \$42,162.66.

Mr. STAFFORD. Making a total altogether of \$408,846.61?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And making a grand total of \$641,309.68?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. That will require a total payment, of the taxes and the amount to the wagon-road company, aggregating \$641,309.68, while the minimum valuation put upon the revested land is \$2,000,000, and the estimates run from \$2,000,000 up to \$4,000,000. The Government will get 75 per cent of that difference. The taxes are ultimately going to be paid out of the sale of the land and timber.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read the report, the \$641,309.68 is the total amount for taxes, penalties, and interest.

Mr. SINNOTT. The total cost to the Government.

Mr. STAFFORD. For taxes alone?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; for taxes and the payment of \$2.50 an acre to the wagon-road company.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is not the way I read that paragraph. Let us read it again:

It will thus be seen that if Congress assumes the obligation of paying all the accrued taxes, with penalty and interest, the total cost to the Government will amount to \$641,309.68.

Mr. SINNOTT. If you add together the \$232,463.07 and the \$408,846.61, it amounts to \$641,309.68.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is correct and I am in error.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is the total payment.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is there any question in the gentleman's mind that the term "taxes unpaid and delinquent" includes penalties and interest?

Mr. SINNOTT. There is some question.

Mr. MANN. I should think so.

Mr. SINNOTT. And in the Oregon land-grant case the Attorney's General's office finally resolved it in favor of paying the penalties and the interest, and I tried to impress upon the committee the importance of clearing that up, but the committee thought otherwise. I wanted to insert the phrase "including penalties and interest," although I think that the Attorney General's office will probably advise the payment of the penalties and the interest. I think, as the gentleman from Illinois does, that the matter should be cleared up now, but I do not feel at liberty to offer the amendment.

Mr. MANN. It is also important in connection with section 5, where it provides for the repayment, that—

after the proceeds from such sales amount to a sum equal to that applied to pay the accrued taxes in that county and a sum equal to \$2.50 per acre for each acre of such land therein title to which is revested in the United States pursuant to the provisions of this act—

certain disposition shall be made of the money. I take it, however, that that is sure to mean whatever taxes are paid.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Whether it includes penalties and interest or not?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think the bill should be amended to insert the phrase "including penalties and interest," but I do not feel at liberty to offer the amendment.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt that before it becomes a law it will be so amended.

Mr. GARD. I ask the gentleman to yield for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. Will the chairman of the committee advise me whether or not it was the intention of the committee to include this matter of penalties and interest?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is my recollection, that it was.

Mr. SINNOTT. I think the committee thought that language included it, but I wanted to make it clear.

Mr. GARD. Another member of the committee advises me that such is not the fact.

Mr. MANN. Are not the penalties and interest a lien on the land, and do they not have to be paid?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The Government has no right to assume to seize this land without paying the taxes that are due upon it, has it? I do not know.

Mr. GARD. I do not know. The matter is one of arrangement between the Government and this corporation as to what shall be paid by the Government.

Mr. MANN. There is a contest between the parties, but the title is in the corporation.

Mr. GARD. The title is in the corporation.

Mr. MANN. And the taxes are assessed against the land.

Mr. GARD. In the transfer of the title there may be a provision as to the amount of taxes to be paid.

Mr. MANN. Here is a case where the taxes are assessed by a municipality. The Government makes an arrangement in the contest by which the Government takes the title back from the private corporation. Meanwhile the taxes have accrued. I doubt very much whether the Government, in compromising with that party, can oust the municipality or county of its right of taxation against this land. Very likely the money has been spent, and it may be bills issued to be paid out of the receipts when collected on this property. I do not know how that is.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer an amendment to clear that matter up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendments will be first disposed of and then the Chair will recognize the gentleman to offer an amendment. The Clerk will first report the amendment to the committee amendment offered by the gentleman from Oregon.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 6, strike out the word "now," at the end of the line.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 24, after the word "years," insert "or who under lease from said company have cultivated and placed valuable improvements upon."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman if this is intended to include persons who may have put on inexpensive improvements and give them a preferential right to the property at \$2.50 an acre?

Mr. SINNOTT. That committee amendment was put in at the suggestion of the Attorney General's office. The gentleman who went out there to investigate the land and the grant reports upon page 16 what he found upon the ground. A great many settlers went upon this land thinking they could compel the Wagon Road Co. to execute a deed to them, for the reason that the granting act contained the language that the grant should be "upon condition that the lands shall be sold to any person only in quantities not greater than a one-quarter section and for a price not exceeding \$2.50 an acre."

Parties went on the land, cultivated it, and plowed and improved it. The court held that no settler could compel the Wagon Road Co. to make a grant to him. So the settlers, in order to protect their rights, entered into leases and agreements with the Wagon Road Co. that they should occupy the land, and in some cases also took options of sale. That committee amendment is for the purpose of taking care of these settlers and those who placed improvements thereupon.

Mr. STAFFORD. The bill as reported takes care of those who have continuously leased from the Wagon Road Co. for not less than 10 years. This will provide for subsequent squatters who happen to go on the land and make improvements.

Mr. SINNOTT. Who leased from the Wagon Road Co. and have cultivated the land and placed improvements thereon. In addition to paying \$2.50 an acre these parties mentioned in the committee amendment would have to pay the taxes accrued against the land. They have that additional burden added to that of the ordinary purchaser.

Mr. MANN. Do they have to pay for the timber?

Mr. SINNOTT. They could not get the timber. If the timber runs over a million two hundred thousand to 160 acres, the land will be classified the same as it is under the Oregon and California land grants.

Mr. MANN. Is there any necessity of having both these provisions in the bill—the one in the bill and now the committee amendment. Are there any of these lessees who have continually leased the land for 10 years who have not made any valuable improvement upon it?

Mr. SINNOTT. That was the information of the Attorney General's office.

Mr. MANN. The information of the Attorney General's office was that people who had leased the land for 10 years continuously and made valuable improvements ought to have priority, of right, but are there any of those who have leased continuously for 10 years and made no improvements on the land? I ask out of curiosity.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not answer it from very specific knowledge, but I understand from information that there are persons who leased under 10-year provisions and who have built houses, barns, fenced the land, and cultivated and made their homes there and who have been paying taxes.

Mr. MANN. There is no occasion for the original provision remaining in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. Let me ask the gentleman if this is intended to take care of those who are mentioned on page 16—mere squatters on the land, who entered into it without any arrangement with the Wagon Road Co.?

Mr. HAWLEY. No; the amendment provides that they must have a lease from the Wagon Road Co.

Mr. STAFFORD. But the lease may be made at any time, and it was the original intention to grant this right to those who had a lease for 10 years.

Mr. HAWLEY. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Attorney General's office points out that there are a few persons who entered on the land without any contractual relations with the Wagon Road Co. and lived there a little while and made some scattering improvements.

Mr. SINNOTT. They are not embraced in this provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; they are if they subsequently got a lease.

Mr. SINNOTT. They must have had a lease and they must have had it for the last five or six years.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no; they could get a lease after this bill passes.

Mr. SINNOTT. The court has enjoined the Wagon Road Co. from making any disposition of the land. That injunction has been in force, I think, since 1914 or 1915.

Mr. MANN. Does that prevent the making of a lease of the ground?

Mr. SINNOTT. Any disposition at all until Congress shall have had an opportunity to pass on it.

Mr. MANN. Are they forbidden to make a lease of the ground?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. SINNOTT. I am.

Mr. MANN. Unless they violate the injunction, there would be no leases granted after this bill passes.

Mr. SINNOTT. No.

Mr. HAWLEY. The lease would be invalid if granted?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know that the lease would be invalid. They might send the man to jail for contempt of court.

Mr. HAWLEY. In answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, my information is that the persons to be taken care of in the amendment of the committee have built good improvements on the land, intending to make it their home; they have built fences and barns and houses and other improvements.

Mr. STAFFORD. They went there without any arrangement with the Wagon Road Co.

Mr. HAWLEY. If any such people are included in this amendment, I do not know of them. I am speaking of those who have not resided on the land for 10 years, but who have resided there for 4 or 5 years and have made good improvements.

Mr. STAFFORD. They are pure squatters, and this is to take care of those people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the other committee amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 4, after the word "acre," insert the words "and reimbursing the United States for the taxes paid on such land: *Provided further.*"

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, lines 15, 16, and 17, after the word "paid," in line 15, strike out the words "to the State treasurer of the State of Oregon, to be and become a part of the irreducible school fund of the State, 25 per cent shall be paid."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, lines 21, 22, 23, and 24, after the word "mentioned," in line 21, strike out the words "40 per cent shall be paid into, reserved, and appropriated as a part of the fund created by the act of June 17, 1902, known as the reclamation act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 6, after the word "the," strike out the words "State and," and after the word "counties," in line 6, strike out the words "and to the reclamation fund."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 20, strike out "\$50,000" and insert "\$12,000."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

SALARY OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY—CONNECTICUT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4246) to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut shall be at the rate of \$5,000 a year.

The committee amendment was read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$4,500."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that this bill is one that has been pending in different shapes here for a number of years. I think the first report was to increase the salary from \$2,500 for the district attorney to \$3,500.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman may possibly be referring to the bill to increase the salary in Rhode Island.

Mr. MANN. Well, it may have been Rhode Island. I do not differentiate between the two—they are both alike; both equally meritorious. Next it was reported to increase the salary from \$2,500 to \$4,000. Now I see the bill is reported to increase the salary from \$2,500 to \$4,500. Does not the gentleman from Connecticut believe it would be a good idea for some one to object so the next Congress may put it to \$5,000; probably the district attorney for so important a district ought to get \$5,000 a year.

Mr. LONERGAN. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman that in the Sixty-third Congress a bill passed the Senate fixing the salary at \$4,000, and the committee which had the matter in charge in the House decided not to deal with questions of this character because it was following the outbreak of the European war, when no such appropriation bills were being considered.

Mr. MANN. Oh, we have had a bill reported from that committee every Congress. I think, for a number of Congresses for this very Rhode Island, increasing the salary from \$2,500 to some amount, as I have stated before.

Mr. LONERGAN. Well, the Sixty-third Congress and this Congress are the only two I know of that considered a bill for Connecticut, and the committee has acted favorably on the pending bill. I will say to the gentleman that the district attorney in Connecticut is obliged to devote all of his time to the performance of the duties of his office. The Attorney General approves of an increase.

The United States district judge wrote a letter stating that the attorney was fully occupied in the performance of his duties and the population of the State of Connecticut has increased between 600,000 and 700,000 since the salary was fixed at \$2,500 something like 50 years ago. We have the largest alien population industrially in the United States.

Mr. MANN. What has that got to do with the district attorney?

Mr. LONERGAN. I was just leading up to it. The war work in the industries has been very great, and we did not have in the State of Connecticut any cases of property destruction or loss of life, because under the jurisdiction of the United States district attorney's office there was a large number of men employed doing detective work, investigation work, and reporting back to the United States district attorney. The office has been efficiently conducted, and I think if the gentleman from Illinois will make inquiry at the office of the Attorney General he will find that they have had as much of the watching of property as any office in the United States of like character.

Mr. MANN. I have not said anything against the district attorney. I doubt very much whether the district attorney has very much to do with watching over the natives or alien population during the war, and, if so, that is past in the main. There may be other reasons, but I rose mainly to suggest to my distinguished friend from Connecticut that this bill is for one district of the United States. It has to go through, if it passes here, and pass the scrutiny of another body of very distinguished people. I trust it will not be weighted down when it comes back with amendments fixing the salary in a lot of the other districts, because if it does it may pass here; I do not know.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. LONERGAN, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ELDORADO, KANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12881) to increase the cost of the public building at Eldorado, Kans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill just reported? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12881) to increase the cost of the public building at Eldorado, Kans.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of the act of Congress approved March 4, 1913, authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to contract for the acquisition, by purchase or otherwise, of a site and to contract for the erection and completion thereon of a suitable building, including fireproof vaults, heating and ventilating apparatus, and approaches, complete, for the use and accommodation of the United States post office and other Government offices at Eldorado, Kans., be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to increase the limit of cost for said building from \$60,000 to \$95,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. AYRES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

UNLAWFUL ORGANIZATIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4471) to declare unlawful associations purposing by physical force, violence, or injury to bring about any governmental, social, industrial, or economic change in the United States, and prescribing punishment for persons engaged in the activities of such associations, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York objects, and the bill is stricken from the calendar. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ADDITIONAL JUDGE FOR DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 714) providing for an additional judge for the district of Arizona.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Indiana object, and the bill is stricken from the calendar.

TIMBER PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN CITIZENS IN OREGON.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12579) to grant citizens of Malheur County, Ore., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Ore.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, let us have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill. The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal the timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding thereto the following:

"That it shall be lawful for the Secretary of the Interior to grant permits, under the provisions of the eighth section of the act of March 3, 1891, to citizens of Malheur County, Ore., to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove the timber so cut to Malheur County, State of Oregon."

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "ninety-one," insert the following: "chapter 561, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1891, chapter 559, page 1093, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill just read?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman who has introduced the bill to inform the House of the necessity for a bill which grants the cutting of

timber in one State to be carried to another State without any apparent limitation as to its use.

Mr. SINNOTT. The present law and regulations permit the cutting of timber not to exceed the value of \$50 in any one year, to be used for the purposes set forth in the act, but that law precludes the use of that timber so cut in any other State than the State in which it is cut, except that the act has been twice amended permitting timber to be taken from Wyoming to Idaho and from Montana to Wyoming. Now, in the section of Oregon seeking relief by this bill there is no timber; there is particularly no timber in the Jordan Valley, on the Oregon side. The Jordan Valley is half in Oregon, in Malheur County, and half in Idaho. Over on the Idaho side there is considerable juniper timber, which may be cut and used for fence posts and for other domestic purposes. Over on the Oregon side they have recently voted a bond issue of some \$900,000 to irrigate lands under a Carey Act project, and unless they can get this timber over on the Idaho side they are going to be very much handicapped and embarrassed in the development of this section of the country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the bill considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose it is perfectly natural that the gentleman who drafted the bill should draft it in the form that he did, but it makes a rather, I was going to say, ludicrous condition of the statutes, because this is a provision to add to the eighth section of a certain law an amendment which says the provision of the eighth section, and so forth, shall not apply. That is the section to which this amendment is added, so that when this law shall be compiled it will read as section so-and-so, and at the end of that section it will refer to itself in a very formal manner, by referring to itself as the eighth section of a certain statute of the United States as amended. It would have been simpler, I would suggest to the gentleman, to amend the section by adding the new language to the provision of this section, and so forth, because this becomes a part of section 8.

Mr. SINNOTT. I probably followed the precedents too slavishly. I merely copied the other old amendments.

Mr. MANN. I am not endeavoring to criticize the gentleman at all. What was done was very natural, but it does make it read rather awkwardly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman advise the House why he made the reference to the law he seeks to amend so specific, by not only citing it by chapter but also by the date on which it was passed? It is not customary to be so specific, to mention the chapter and then add the date of the approval of the act.

Mr. SINNOTT. I will say to the gentleman that there were two acts passed about the same time, and the date was included so as to distinguish between the two.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; but the two acts did not bear the same title. It says:

That section 8 of an act entitled "An act to repeal the timber-culture laws, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, chapter 561, as amended by an act approved March 3, 1891, chapter 559, page 1093, volume 26, United States Statutes at Large.

I do not think the gentleman could find anything else in the statute whereby he could describe the act which he intends to amend more specifically.

Mr. SINNOTT. There has always been a matter of uncertainty—

Mr. MANN. No; it has not been a matter of uncertainty. It is a fact that the Land Office and the Department of the Interior have recommended this sort of thing for years, and I have almost reached the conclusion that it is a good thing.

If there is one difficult thing to find it is something in the Statutes at Large where you refer to the date of the statute and the date of the approval, because the dear compilers of the Statutes at Large will not print on each page of the Statutes at Large the date of the approval of the act, but they simply put in the chapter, and if you know the date of the approval of the act you can look and find it. In the case of appropriation bills you have to look at the end or the beginning in order to find the date. Now, these people have recommended an amendment which permits anyone at a moment's notice to turn to the page of the statute where the matter is to be found, and to know exactly how to find it, and where to find it, and find it quickly.

Mr. STAFFORD. The reference to the page is surplusage. Mr. MANN. It is all surplusage. I can find it by reference to the title.

Mr. STAFFORD. But it is not necessary to put it in.

Mr. MANN. I say it is not necessary to put any of it in, but I am getting around to the conclusion, that it is a good thing to put in the chapter and page, so as to find it quickly in the Statutes at Large. Our statutes of the United States are now so jumbled up that the famed "Philadelphia lawyer" can not find what he is hunting one time in two.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to delay the passage of this bill or take up the time of the House more than a moment, but I want to congratulate the Committee on Public Lands on their energy and capacity for getting out their own bills. There are quite a number on this calendar from that committee, and they are making progress and passing bills. I hope they will soon have their bills all wound up, so that they can pay some attention to the bills of other Members who are not on the committee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will say to the gentleman that from the commencement of this session of Congress in December the chairman of that committee [Mr. FERRIS] has been unavoidably away on account of sickness.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I suppose he was overworked in the handling of a national campaign. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; both he and his wife have been quite ill with the "flu." Politics has nothing to do with his absence. But he will not be here next week. I have been acting as chairman of the Public Lands Committee thus far this session and I have tried to give every man who has a bill pending before the committee an opportunity to come before the committee, and we have heard everybody who has come. You have not appeared before the committee this session. We have had several meetings and hearings have been given to everyone who asked recognition, I think. We have endeavored to finish up as nearly as we can all the important business and not at all confine our actions to bills in which the membership of the committee are interested. In fact, we put in practically all this morning listening to Senators and Senate bills. There has been no thought whatever of selfishly reporting out only our own bills. But it is perfectly natural that the members of that committee from the public-land States should have more of those bills than other Members do. However, any Member who has a bill that ought to pass can very easily get a hearing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I congratulate the gentleman. I have had a bill pending there for a long time, and I have been promised several times that I shall have a hearing.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Has the gentleman ever asked for a hearing?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; I have asked for a hearing many times.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If I am acting chairman, as I probably will be, I assure the gentleman he will be accorded a hearing if he appears before the committee next Saturday morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have asked for a hearing many times, as the chairman of the committee and the secretary will testify.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman, for his satisfaction, that the committee ordered favorably reported four of the gentleman's bills this morning.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am very glad to hear it; and on the strength of that statement I will withdraw my pro forma amendment. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

EULOGIES ON THE LATE SENATOR BRADY, OF IDAHO.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Sunday, January 26, be set aside for addresses on the life, character, and services of the late Senator BRADY, of Idaho.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that Sunday, January 26, be set aside for addresses on the life, character, and services of the late Senator BRADY, of Idaho.

There was no objection.

WATER SUPPLY FOR OLATHE, COLO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5989) to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, these seem to be public-land bills. I will ask the gentleman if he intends to have the House adjourn as soon as this bill passes?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; I was hoping that we could let it run through this whole page. Here are nine public-land bills, all of which are meritorious measures.

Mr. MANN. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois and to the House that the only way under the sun that the western Members of this House can ever get an opportunity to have these necessary bills passed is by their consideration on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman does not need to spend any time in telling me that. I know that.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. MANN. I did not take up the time of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I know the gentleman has not. He has been treating us very nicely.

Mr. MANN. It was the gentleman's side of the House that wasted time to-day.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; we have not wasted any time.

Mr. MANN. Why, surely.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think either side has wasted any time.

Mr. MANN. First, you wasted time in two roll calls on a contested-election case. Then you wasted time on some other matters. The delay did not come from this side of the House. It does not lie in the mouth of any gentleman on that side of the House to lecture this side of the House about wasting time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I have not been lecturing anybody.

Mr. MANN. Especially in view of what has taken place since the first Monday in December.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado to consider this bill in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

There was no objection.

The bill was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the town of Olathe, county of Montrose, and State of Colorado, the southeast quarter of section 24, township 48 north, range 12, and the south half of section 19, and the southwest quarter of section 20, both in township 48 north, range 11 west, of the New Mexico principal meridian, in said county and State, containing 640 acres, more or less, to have and to hold said lands for the purpose of the protection of the reservoirs and water-supply pipe lines and water-works system of said town: *Provided*, That the said town of Olathe shall, within two years from the passage of this act, pay for said lands, or such portions thereof as may be necessary for said purposes, at the rate of \$1.25 per acre: *Provided further*, That the grant hereby made is, and the patent issued thereunder shall be, subject to all legal rights heretofore acquired by any person or persons in or to the above-described premises, or any part thereof, and now existing under and by virtue of the laws of the United States: *And provided further*, That there shall be reserved to the United States all oil, coal, and other mineral deposits that may be found in the lands so granted, and all necessary use of the lands for extracting the same.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 14, after the word "same" insert the following:

"*And provided further*, That title to the land shall revert to the United States should the same or any part thereof be sold or cease to be used for the purposes herein provided."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TELEGRAPHS AND TELEPHONES.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a letter discussing the telegraph and telephone systems and the wisdom of the union of the two and the Government ownership of the same. This letter is written by Mr. Theodore N. Vail, president of one of these companies.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand that Mr. Vail is now associated with the Government in the operation and direction of the telephone and telegraph systems of the country.

Mr. MOON. I do not know whether he is or not.

Mr. STAFFORD. If he is not, I shall be constrained to object. I understand that he occupies some official capacity with the Government.

Mr. MOON. He may. I do not know whether he does or does not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, until I can get the information—

Mr. STEENERSON. I have seen the statement in the newspapers that he is the official adviser of the Postmaster General on telegraphs and telephones.

Mr. STAFFORD. If he occupies some official capacity with the Government, I have no objection to the matter being inserted in the Record. Otherwise, I shall object.

Mr. MOON. I do not know, but I accept the statement of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COAL LANDS IN ALASKA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 35) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether this bill extends to others than qualified homestead entrymen?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think so. I have not the general law before me, but it is to allow agricultural entries on lands reserved for coal lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to direct the attention of the gentleman to the designation that it applies to "actual settlers." That does not mean qualified entrymen. It would apply to any person who happened to locate upon Government land.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think there was any intentional point in that matter. It was to make the law extend to the Territory of Alaska. We have a law allowing agricultural entries on the surface of coal lands.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is it the purpose to grant them the privilege of entering upon unsurveyed public lands?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think so. My recollection is that there are great quantities of land in Alaska not surveyed and perhaps will not be for 50 years.

Mr. STAFFORD. Do we authorize entries in the States on unsurveyed public lands?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes, forest reserves; and survey it out by metes and bounds.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR RECLAMATION OF LANDS IN OREGON.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13042) providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Let us have the bill read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, within his discretion, to extend for a period of not exceeding 10 years the time of segregation in the Oregon Carey Act segregation list No. 13, comprising approximately 27,000 acres of land, same being situated in Deschutes County, Oreg., provided the Secretary of the Interior is further authorized to grant to the State of Oregon a similar extension of 10 years for the reclamation of said lands in addition to the time allotted under existing rules, regulations, contracts, and laws,

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, within his discretion, to continue to not beyond January 12, 1929, the segregation of the lands embraced in approved Oregon segregation list No. 13, under the Carey Act.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if it is customary to use in the law the expression "Carey Act"?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes; it is referred to in those words in various statutes. This amendment came from the department and was recommended by the department.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The Carey Act has a well-defined meaning to our minds, but has it a well-defined meaning in the courts?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think it has a well-defined meaning in the courts. Everyone understands it as well as they do the "reclamation law."

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. It is referred to in the courts as the Carey Act.

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was again read for amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT TO THE ESPIONAGE ACT.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9094) to amend section 1 of Title VIII of the act entitled "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 15, 1917.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill, and it is too late to give it the consideration that it ought to have. I suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that it go over.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois makes a point of no quorum. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, would it be in order for me to move that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not think that anything is in order after the fact is ascertained that no quorum is present.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, the following leave of absence was granted:

To Mr. TAGUE, leave of absence indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. BRAND, for five days, on account of illness.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. ZIHLMAN, by unanimous consent, was given leave to withdraw from the files of the House papers, without leaving copies, in the case of John T. Wheeler, Company I, Seventeenth West Virginia Volunteers, Sixty-fifth Congress, no adverse report being made thereon.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 11 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, January 8, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation, with the recommendation that it be given favorable consideration for inclusion in the sundry civil appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1644); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the health department of the District of Columbia for preventing the spread of contagious diseases, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1645); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting a paragraph of legislation extending during the fiscal year 1920 the appropriation and authorization made by the act of July 1, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1646); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a statement of the number of men in the service of the commission exempted from military duty or placed in deferred classification on request of the commission (H. Doc. No. 1647); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the secretary of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting a statement of employees of the United States Shipping Board and Emergency Fleet Corporation who have been exempted from military duty or given deferred classification (H. Doc. No. 1648); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list showing the number of men in the service of the War Department at Washington for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification were asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1649); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the Secretary of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting a statement showing all the employees of the Emergency Fleet Corporation who have been given deferred classification (H. Doc. No. 1650); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting lists of employees of the Department of Justice for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification were asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1651); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

9. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, transmitting a list of employees of the Department of Labor for whom requests for deferred classification were asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1652); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

10. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a list of employees for whom requests for exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1653); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

11. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a list of employees of the Department of Commerce for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification have been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1654); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

12. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting names of men in the active or reserve forces of the Military Establishment, commissioned or enlisted, who have been assigned to clerical work and placed in deferred classification by reason of such assignment (H. Doc. No. 1655); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

13. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a statement showing the number of employees of the Department of the Interior for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification has been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1656); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

14. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting, with a letter from the Secretary of State, the number of men in the service of the State Department for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification has been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1657); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

15. A letter from the President of the United States, transmitting the number of men in the service of the Food Administrator, Fuel Administrator, and all boards and commissions appointed by Executive order since April 6, 1917, for whom exemption from military duty or deferred classification has been asked and allowed (H. Doc. No. 1658); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

16. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting reports from accounting officers of the Treasury Department, showing what officers of the Government were delinquent in rendering their accounts for the fiscal year ended June

30, 1918, with a list of such officers, who, upon final settlement of their accounts, were found indebted to the Government, and who at the date of the report had failed to pay the same into the Treasury of the United States (H. Doc. No. 1659); to the Committee on Expenditures in Treasury Department and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHERLEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 892), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DILLON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 5058) to authorize the counties of Morton and Burleigh, in the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near Bismarck, N. Dak., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 893), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4966) to extend the time for the construction by the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, of a bridge or bridges over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakeley Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 894), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13446) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River at or near Sixteenth Street, in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 895), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13427) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Monongahela River at or near the borough of Wilson, in the county of Allegheny, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 896), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13429) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Allegheny, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Ohio River at or near McKees Rocks Borough, in the county of Allegheny, Pa., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 897), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12513) granting an increase of pension to Henry Robert; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12078) granting a pension to Hodges W. Drayton; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged; and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12839) granting a pension to Bronislawa Wypiewski; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12938) granting an increase of pension to Joe Loudermilk, jr.; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 13671) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion, and to secure the

abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HUDDLESTON: A bill (H. R. 13672) for the relief of soldiers who have not had service overseas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 13673) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Easton, Pa., four German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13674) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bethlehem, Pa., three German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 13675) to increase the compensation of pressmen in the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BIRCH: A bill (H. R. 13676) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Boonton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13677) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Dover, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13678) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Madison, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13679) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morristown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13680) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elizabeth, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13681) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Rahway, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13682) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Summit, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13683) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Plainfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13684) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Westfield, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BACHARACH: A bill (H. R. 13685) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape May, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13686) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wildwood, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13687) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ocean City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13688) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Burlington, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mount Holly, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moorestown, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13691) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bridgeton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13692) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Millville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13693) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Vineland, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13694) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Pleasantville, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13695) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mays Landing, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13696) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hammonton, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13697) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Atlantic City, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13698) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cape May Court House, N. J., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KALANIANA'OLE: A bill (H. R. 13699) to authorize the governor of the Territory of Hawaii to acquire privately owned lands and rights of way within the boundaries of the Hawaii National Park; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. RAYBURN: A bill (H. R. 13700) donating captured cannon and cannon balls to the city of Bonham, Tex.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 13701) to provide a commission to secure plans and designs for an arch to be erected in the city of Washington, D. C., to be known as the Arch of Victory, to commemorate the heroes and events of the great war; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SNELL: A bill (H. R. 13702) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gouverneur, N. Y., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 13703) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the borough of Catasauqua, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13704) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Reading, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Allentown, Pa., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 13706) to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13707) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the operation of transportation systems while under Federal control, for the just compensation of their owners, and for other purposes," approved March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 13708) providing for the relief of such populations in Europe, outside of Germany, as may be determined upon by the President as necessary; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BAER: A bill (H. R. 13709) to create a department of education and human welfare and to arrange for the co-operation between the Federal Government and the States in the encouragement and support of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 13710) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Roodhouse, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13711) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Carrollton, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13712) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Mount Sterling, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13713) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchester, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13714) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of White Hall, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 13715) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Jefferson Davis Home Association one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13716) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Woman's College, Hattiesburg, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13717) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Mississippi State Normal College, Hattiesburg, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Gulf Coast Military Academy, Gulfport, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the St. Stanislaus College, Bay St. Louis, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13720) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Covington, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13721) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Stone, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13722) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Simpson, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13723) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Perry, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13724) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Pearl River, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13725) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lamar, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13726) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Marion, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13727) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Lawrence, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13728) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jones, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13729) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Wayne, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13730) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Forrest, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13731) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of George, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Greene, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Hancock, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13734) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Harrison, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13735) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jackson, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13736) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the county of Jefferson Davis, Miss., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 13737) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Amarillo, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13738) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Childress, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13739) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Memphis, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13740) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Quanah, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13741) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clarendon, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13742) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lubbock, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13743) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Snyder, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13744) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Plainview, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13745) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Canadian, Tex., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13746) for the erection of a public building in the city of Lubbock, the county seat of Lubbock County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13747) for the erection of a public building in the city of Plainview, the county seat of Hale County, State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13748) for the erection of a public building in the city of Canadian, the county seat of Hemphill County,

State of Texas, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13749) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Medford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13750) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cambridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WINSLOW: A bill (H. R. 13751) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Hopkinton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13752) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Worcester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13753) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Blackstone, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13754) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Uxbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13755) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Northbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13756) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13757) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Westboro, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13758) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Melrose, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 13759) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fall River, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANTRILL: A bill (H. R. 13760) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Paris, Ky., two German cannon or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 13761) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to each of the cities of Americus, Cordele, and Fitzgerald, Ga., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PAIGE: A bill (H. R. 13762) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Gardner, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Princetown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13764) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Palmer, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13765) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Marre, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13766) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Orange, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13767) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Monson, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13768) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Athol, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13769) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Webster, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13770) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Holden, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13771) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Lancaster, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13772) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Brookfield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13773) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Spencer, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13774) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Leominster, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13775) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13776) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ashby, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13777) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Ashburnham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13778) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Dudley, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13779) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Oxford, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13780) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Southbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13781) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Clinton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13782) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fitchburg, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13783) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchendon, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13784) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Templeton, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13785) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sturbridge, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13786) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Sterling, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 13787) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Breckenridge, Wilkin County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13788) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Roseau, Roseau County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13789) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Red Lake Falls, Red Lake County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13790) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Crookston, Polk County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13791) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Detroit, Becker County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13792) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Thief River Falls, Pennington County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13793) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Warren, Marshall County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13794) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Hallock, Kittson County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13795) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moorhead, Clay County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13796) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ada, Norman County, State of Minnesota, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13797) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fergus Falls, Ottertail County, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13798) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Mahanomen, Mahanomen County, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13799) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bagley, Clearwater County, Minn., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELSTON: Resolution (H. Res. 495) requesting the President of the United States to open negotiations with the Republic of Mexico for the purchase of the peninsula of Lower California and contiguous territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHERLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 496) for the consideration of House bill 13708; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Resolution (H. Res. 497) providing for the consideration of Senate bill 714; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LaGUARDIA: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 379) authorizing the War Department to employ civilians to perform clerical and manual work in order to insure the immediate discharge of soldiers now performing such duties; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CARAWAY: A bill (H. R. 13800) for the relief of claimants of certain unsurveyed lands in Mississippi County, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRAMTON: A bill (H. R. 13801) granting an increase of pension to Horace E. Hand; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DILL: A bill (H. R. 13802) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant to John D. Sherwood, of Spokane, Wash., the right to overflow certain lands on the Fort George Wright Military Reservation, at Spokane, Wash., and to accept the conveyance to the United States of other lands to be designated by the Secretary of War and suitable for a rifle range in exchange for the land so overflowed; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: A bill (H. R. 13803) granting an increase of pension to Catherine McQuade; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 13804) granting a pension to William Unfug; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13805) granting an increase of pension to John W. Paulus; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLAND: A bill (H. R. 13806) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 13807) authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the screen-wagon contract of H. L. McFarlin, of Little Rock, Ark.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 13808) granting a pension to Annie K. Squier; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MERRITT: A bill (H. R. 13809) granting a pension to Bridget Finan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SELLS: A bill (H. R. 13810) granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: A bill (H. R. 13811) granting an increase of pension to Walter R. D. Vaughan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13812) granting a pension to Phillip Lockwood; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 13813) granting a pension to Sarah Jane Vanpelt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13814) striking from the pension roll the name of Sylvester Lane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (13815) granting a pension to George J. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TINKHAM: A bill (H. R. 13816) granting a pension to Eliza K. Leman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 13817) for the relief of Jose Lopez Castelo; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 13818) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Huntley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13819) granting an increase of pension to R. Franklin Chase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13820) granting an increase of pension to William L. Pratt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Resolutions by Charles Schloeg, of Milwaukee, Wis., relating to the price of wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Resolutions adopted at a meeting of county superintendents of schools of Wisconsin, urging enactment of legislation to provide for a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Senate of Porto Rico, praying the Congress of the United States to aid victims of earthquakes in Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Lumberman's Exchange, of St. Louis, favoring placing the railroads under the control of the Interstate Commerce Commission; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Federal Labor Union, No. 15034, American Federation of Labor, of Streator, Ill., favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan: Resolutions by representative business men of the town of White Pigeon, Mich., praying support of Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Resolutions by the common council of the city of New Britain, Conn., relating to the independence of Ireland and other countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the Portland (Oreg.) Traffic and Transportation Association, to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission the powers taken away by the Federal control act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions by the Vallejo (Cal.) Employees' Union, No. 76, recommending Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolutions by the Western Pine Manufacturing Association, petitioning the restoration to the Interstate Commerce Commission of the powers taken from it under the Federal-control act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of West Coast Lumberman's Association to restore to the Interstate Commerce Commission the rights taken from it by the act of March 21, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of F. H. Staub, of Fergus Falls, Minn., relating to taxes on jewelry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Oscar M. Sullivan, chairman Commission on Rehabilitation of Industrial Cripples, St. Paul, Minn., urging early and favorable action upon Senate bill 4922 and House bill 12880; to the Committee on Education.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 8, 1919.

The House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we stand before Thee with bowed heads and sorrowing hearts as a great leader, among the leaders of the Nation, is being laid to his final rest. Peace be to his ashes and rest to his soul.

A Nation is in tears. Many distinguished men, who loved and admired him for his sterling qualities, his energy, skill, and undaunted courage, will give their presence to the last rites that mortals can bestow upon the dead. Their tears will mingle with the tears of the bereaved wife and children.

Comfort them, we beseech Thee, with the promise handed down to us out of the ages.

There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life elysian,
Whose portal we call Death.

Thus comfort the Nation and the world and inspire the living with an earnest desire to follow his illustrious example; and Thine be the glory through Christ the Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill and joint reso-

lutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5192. An act for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Jackson Street, in the city of Janesville, Wis.; S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution for relief in Alaska; and S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to the Congress certain suggestions.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Alma Harris.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolutions of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to its appropriate committee, as indicated below:

S. 5192. An act for the construction of a bridge across Rock River at or near Jackson Street, in the city of Janesville, Wis.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. J. Res. 199. Joint resolution for relief in Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations.

S. J. Res. 202. Joint resolution requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to Congress certain suggestions; to the Committee on the Library.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BRAND, for 10 days, on account of illness; and
To Mr. MAYS, at the request of Mr. WELLING, indefinitely, on account of serious illness in his family.

RESIGNATION OF A MEMBER.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communications, which were read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,
WASHINGTON, D. C., January 6, 1919.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I hereby resign my office as Representative in the Congress of the United States from the at-large district of Pennsylvania.

Very sincerely,

JOHN R. K. SCOTT.

PHILADELPHIA, PA., January 7, 1919.

SECRETARY TO HON. CHAMP CLARK,
Speaker House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

My resignation to take effect January 5, 1919.

JOHN R. K. SCOTT.

RECESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, as a further mark of respect to the distinguished ex-President of the United States, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt, whose funeral will presently take place, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that the House stand in recess until 2 o'clock p. m. as a mark of respect to the memory of the late Theodore Roosevelt. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock p. m.

AFTER THE RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire on what subject the gentleman intends to address the House?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to present to the House through a letter received from a sailor boy what I consider a very grave hardship which is being suffered by many sailors whose applications for discharge have been already approved.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the gentleman taken it up with the Navy Department?

Mr. POU. If the gentleman will refrain from making that request I will yield him five minutes on the discussion on the rule I now present.

Mr. BLANTON. I will be glad to do so.

MARY C. CARPENTER.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.